LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

PR 3581 .M41 v.4
Masson, David
The life of John Milton

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Princeton Theological Seminary Library

https://archive.org/details/lifeofjohnmilton04mass_1

THE LIFE

OF

JOHN MILTON,

AND

HISTORY OF HIS TIME.

THE LIFE

OF

JOHN MILTON:

NARRATED IN CONNEXION WITH
THE POLITICAL, ECCLESIASTICAL, AND LITERARY

HISTORY OF HIS TIME.

BY

DAVID MASSON, M.A., LL.D.,

PROFESSOR OF RHETORIC AND ENGLISH LITERATURE
IN THE UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH.

VOL. IV.

1649 — 1654.

London:
MACMILLAN AND CO.
1877.

[*The Right of Translation is reserved.*]

OXFORD:
E. PICKARD HALL, M.A., AND J. H. STACY,
PRINTERS TO THE UNIVERSITY.

PREFATORY NOTE TO VOLUMES IV. AND V.

The two volumes now published together contain a History of the English Commonwealth, a History of Cromwell's Interim Dictatorship and of his First and Second Protectorates, and a History of the Protectorate of Richard Cromwell and of the subsequent Anarchy to the Restoration. They also contain the Biography of Milton through those eleven years, with an account of his Secretaryship and other relations to the successive Governments, and an elucidated inventory and abstract of his State-Letters.

Volume VI., which is in progress, will complete the work, and will be accompanied by a copious Index to the whole.

EDINBURGH : *November*, 1877.

CONTENTS.

BOOK I.

JANUARY 1648-9—JULY 1649.

HISTORY:—FOUNDATION AND BEGINNINGS OF AN ENGLISH REPUBLIC.

BIOGRAPHY:—MILTON'S ADHESION TO THE REPUBLIC: HIS *TENURE OF KINGS AND MAGISTRATES*: COMMENCEMENT OF HIS LATIN SECRETARYSHIP.

CHAP. PAGE

I. Foundation and Beginnings of an English Republic 3

Constitution of the New Republic: Preconceptions on the subject: Ireton's Draft *Agreement of the People*.—Creation of a Council of State: Composition of the First Council: Its first Meetings and Difficulties: Cromwell's paramount Activity.—Forms and Routine of the Council 6

Circumstances of the Infant Commonwealth:—Danger from Scotland: Proclamation of Charles II. there by the Argyle-Warriston Government: Hatred of the Scots to the Commonwealth.—Danger from Ireland: Proclamation of Charles II. there by Ormond: Small hold of the Commonwealth upon Ireland.—Court of Charles II. at the Hague: Scottish Negotiations and Intrigues there: The Marquis of Montrose again.—Sentiments of the various Foreign Powers. 19

Opposition to the Commonwealth within England: Strength and Intensity of English Royalism: The *Eikon Basilike* and its Effects: Royalist Pamphlets and Newspapers: Marchamont Needham and the *Mercurius Pragmaticus* 32

The Government continued in the Rump Parliament and the Council of State: Their first Acts: Resolution for the Reconquest of Ireland by Cromwell: Home Difficulties: Lilburne and the London Conspiracy of Levellers: Army-Mutiny.—Relations with Foreign Powers: Assassination of Dorislaus.—Suppression of the Levellers 39

Triumphant Confirmation of the Republic: The *Fairfaxian Creation* at Oxford, and the London City Banquet: Removal of the Council of State to Whitehall: Removal of Charles II. from the Hague: Departure of Cromwell for the Lord-Lieutenancy of Ireland: State of England as he left it 51

Cessation of the Westminster Assembly: Its Bequests to England and to Scotland: The Scottish Kirk in 1649. 58

CHAP. PAGE

II. Milton's Adhesion to the Republic: His *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*: Analysis of that Pamphlet: His Acceptance of the Secretaryship for Foreign Tongues to the Council of State: Nature of the Office: His first Attendances at the Council and first official Employments: Extracts relating to him from the Council Order-Books: His Letter to the Hamburg Senate, &c.: Literary tasks assigned him by the Council: *Observations on Ormond's Peace with the Irish and on the Scotch Presbytery of Belfast*: Account of the Pamphlet: Change of Residence to Charing Cross: Friends and Acquaintances of this date: His Commission to answer the *Eikon Basilike* 64

BOOK II.

JULY 1649—APRIL 1653.

HISTORY:—ANNALS OF THE COMMONWEALTH:—

FIRST YEAR OF THE COMMONWEALTH CONTINUED: JULY 10, 1649—FEB. 18, 1649–50.

SECOND YEAR OF THE COMMONWEALTH: FEB. 18, 1649–50—FEB. 18, 1650–51.

THIRD YEAR OF THE COMMONWEALTH: FEB. 18, 1650–51—DEC. 1, 1651.

FOURTH YEAR OF THE COMMONWEALTH, AND FRAGMENT OF A FIFTH: DEC. 1, 1651—APRIL 20, 1653.

BIOGRAPHY:—MILTON'S LIFE THROUGH THE PERIOD OF THE COMMONWEALTH, WITH HIS SECRETARYSHIP UNDER FIVE SUCCESSIVE COUNCILS OF STATE.

CHAP. PAGE

I. Cromwell's Victories in Ireland: Activity of the Parliament and Council of State at home: Royalist and Levelling Pamphlets: Bradshaw's new Press Act: Trial of Lilburne and his Fellow-Levellers: Their Acquittal: Case of Clement Walker: Continued Disaffection of the Presbyterians: Endeavours to humour them: *The Engagement*: State of Foreign Relations: Missions to Spain, Portugal, and Hamburg: Election of New Council of State: Death of the Earl of Pembroke 111

II. Milton's Life and Secretaryship from July 1649 to Feb. 1649–50.—Enormous Popularity of the *Eikon Basilike*: Doubts as to the Authorship: Milton's *Eikonoklastes*: Analysis of the same, with Quotations: Particles of Milton's Biography from the Council Order-Books, with Notices of Marchamont Needham, Clement Walker, the Printer Newcome, the Printer Royston, the Printer Dugard, and others: Milton's Removal from Charing-Cross to an Official Residence in Whitehall: His Miscellaneous Official Occupations: Five of his Latin State Letters to Foreign Powers (Nos. I.–V.); Salmasius and his *Defensio Regia*: Account of the Book, with Specimens: Milton's Commission from the Council of State to answer the Book . . 129

CHAP. PAGE

III. Annals of the Commonwealth: Second Year. Feb. 18, 1649–50 to Feb. 18, 1650–51.——Changes in the Composition of the Council: Enforcing of the Engagement: Miscellaneous Proceedings of Parliament and the Council: Measures to please the Presbyterians: The Treaty of Breda between Charles II. and the Scots: Landing of the Marquis of Montrose in Scotland: His Fate: Arrival of Charles II. in Scotland as a Covenanted King: Recall of Cromwell from Ireland to command in the Scottish War: His Reception in London, and Appointment to the Generalship-in-Chief for the Commonwealth: Declaration of War against the Scots: News of the Assassination of Ascham at Madrid: Retirement of Fairfax from Public Life: Cromwell's Invasion of Scotland: David Leslie's Strategy on the Scottish side: Battle of Dunbar: Cromwell in Edinburgh, and Master of the South-East Scottish Lowlands: Division of the Scots into Three Parties: Severe Treatment of Charles by the Argyle or Government Party: "The Start," and its Consequences: Better Treatment of Charles: Coalition of the Government Party and the Northern Royalists: *Remonstrance* of the Western Whigs: Cromwell's March westward: Lambert's Action at Hamilton: All Scotland South of the Firths in possession of the English, and only Scotland North of the Firths left to Charles: His Coronation at Scone: Affairs in England: Effects of the Battle of Dunbar on Foreign Powers: End of the Second Year of the Commonwealth, and Election of a new Council of State 176

IV. Milton's Life and Secretaryship from Feb. 1649–50 to Feb. 1650–51.——Extracts from the Council Order-Books relating to Milton, with Notices of Needham, Dugard, Durie, Hartlib, Haak, Hugh Peters, and others: Twelve of Milton's Latin State-Letters (Nos. VI.–XVII.): Mrs. Powell's Suit for Recovery of the Family Property, and Milton's Interest in the same: His Petition and Affidavit as to his Wheatley Estate: Second and Enlarged Edition of the *Eikonoklastes*: Specimens of the New Matter: *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio contra Salmasium*: Circumstances of its Preparation: Account of the Book, with Illustrative Extracts: Its tremendous Personalities: Salmasius now at Stockholm: Queen Christina of Sweden and her Court 223

V. Annals of the Commonwealth: Third Year, Feb. 18, 1650–1 to Dec. 1, 1651.——New Council of State: Relations with Spain: Negotiation with the Portuguese Ambassador: Embassy of St. John and Strickland to the United Provinces: Affairs in Scotland: Cromwell's Illness there: Effects of the English Occupation among the Scots: State of Scotland North of the Firths: Charles II. and his Scottish Court: Parliament at Perth and Stirling: Decline of the Argyle Influence: *Resolutioners* and *Remonstrants*: Charles's Scottish Army: Disgrace of Lord Howard of Escrick: English Presbyterian Conspiracy for Charles II.: Case of Mr. Love and Mr. Gibbons: Cromwell's March upon Stirling: Access blocked by Leslie: Device of a Passage through Fifeshire: Cromwell at Perth: Sudden March of Charles and the Scots into England: Cromwell's rapid Pursuit: Excitement throughout England: Execution of Love and Gibbons: Battle of Worcester: The Captives and Fugitives: Conquest of Scotland completed by Monk: New Honours for Cromwell: Execution of the Earl of Derby and others: Scottish Prisoners in England: Escape of Charles II.: The Marquis of

CHAP. PAGE

Argyle in Scotland: View of his Character and Career: Decree for the Incorporation of Scotland with the Commonwealth: Clement Home Policy after Worcester: Navigation Act against the Dutch: Cromwell's Motion for assigning a Term to the Rump Parliament: Motion carried: Victorious Close of the Third Year of the Commonwealth 272

VI. Milton's Life and Secretaryship from Feb. 1650–51 to Dec. 1651. ——Publication of Milton's *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio contra Salmasium*: Extracts about Milton from the Council Order-Books: Proposal to remove him from his Whitehall Lodgings: Interference of the Council: Sensation caused by the *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio* on the Continent: Its Reception at Stockholm by Salmasius and Queen Christina: Gossip about Salmasius and Milton from the Vossius-Heinsius Correspondence: Rumour of a forthcoming Reply by Salmasius to the *Defensio*: Vote of Thanks to Milton by the Council: Extracts from the Council Order-Books continued: Two of Milton's Latin State Letters (Nos. XVIII. and XIX.): Milton's Censorship or Superintending Editorship of the *Mercurius Politicus*, and his Connexion with Marchamont Needham: Account of the *Mercurius Politicus*, with Specimens of its Articles: Leading Article on the Battle of Worcester: Birth of Milton's third Child, a Son: Mrs. Powell and Milton: Progress of her Suit: Continued fame of Milton's *Defensio*: More Gossip from the Vossius-Heinsius Correspondence: Salmasius Crestfallen at Christina's Court: His Return to Leyden: No appearance of his Reply to Milton: Anonymous substitute for it in a *Pro Rege et Populo Anglicano Apologia*: Account of the Book: *Eikon Aklastos*, an Anonymous Reply to the *Eikonoklastes*: Milton's European Celebrity: Christopher Arnold's Visit to London: His Gossip about Milton and other Londoners . . . 311

VII. Annals of the Commonwealth: Fourth Year and Fragment of a Fifth. Dec. 1, 1651 to April 20, 1653.——Council of State of the Fourth Year, and Fifth Council of State.—Death of Ireton: John Lilburne again: His Banishment: Stability of the Commonwealth after the Battle of Worcester: The Rump Government in its Relations with Cromwell: Measures for the Union of Scotland with the Commonwealth: Commissioners for the Union sent to Scotland: Feelings of the Scots on the subject: Success of the Commissioners: Act of Incorporation brought in and the Union declared: English Administration in Scotland, and State of that Country: View of the State of Ireland: Lambert appointed to succeed Ireton there: The Post declined by Lambert, and Fleetwood appointed: Acts for the Settlement of Ireland: Fleetwood's Irish Administration: Embassy from the United Provinces: Negotiations with the same: Animosity between the English and the Dutch: Encounter between Blake and Van Tromp in the Downs: Additional Ambassador from the Provinces: Failure of the Embassy: War between the Dutch and the Commonwealth: Blake's Naval Battles and Victories: Synopsis of the Relations of the Commonwealth with other Foreign Powers: Internal Affairs of England: Questions of Retrenchment, Political Oblivion, Law-Reform, Pauperism, and Regulation of the Press: Grand Question of *The Propagation of the Gospel*: What was involved in this Question: Committee of Parliament on the Subject: Proposals of certain Ministers to the Committee: Conflict of Opinion, and appeals to Cromwell: Provisional Votes in Parliament about

CHAP. PAGE

Tithes: Roger Williams again in England: His Activity: Year's Deliberation of the *Committee* for *the Propagation of the Gospel*: Results: Precariousness of the Rump Government: Independent Authority of Cromwell: His Private Meditations: The Army in England, Scotland, and Ireland: Petition of the Army Officers: Its Effects: Bill for Dissolution of the existing Parliament and Election of a new Representative: Difficulties: Meetings of Cromwell and the Officers: Schism on the Bill for a new Representative: Historical Doubts and Speculations: Narrative of the Events of April 13—20, 1653: Cromwell's Dissolution of the Rump and of the Council of State 354

VIII. Milton's Life and Secretaryship from Dec. 1651 to April 1653. ——Letter to Hermann Mylius: Removal of Milton and his Family, in Dec. 1651, from Whitehall to Petty France, Westminster: The new House and its Neighbourhood: Extracts relating to Milton from the Council Order-Books from Dec. 1651 to April 1652: Weckherlin brought in as temporary assistant to Milton in the Latin Secretaryship: Death of Mr. Gualter Frost, the General Secretary to the Council, and Appointment of Mr. John Thurloe to be his Successor: Milton's Blindness complete about April 1652: His expectation of the Calamity and preparations for it: Arrangement of his Official Duties to suit: End of his Censorship or Superintending Editorship of the *Mercurius Politicus*: Two more Anti-Miltonic Pamphlets belonging to the Salmasian Controversy: Affair of the Racovian Catechism: The Sonnet to Cromwell and the Sonnet to Vane: Precise Circumstances of these Sonnets: Resumption of Secretarial Work by Milton: Extracts relating to him from the Council Order-Books from July 1652 to April 1653, with Notices of Brian Walton, Haak, Durie, Needham, Mr. John Pell, and others: Durie's French Translation of the *Eikonoklastes*: Farther Modification of Milton's Secretaryship and transference of part of the Duty to Thurloe: Letter to the Greek Leonard Philaras: No appearance yet of Salmasius himself in reply to Milton: Publication at the Hague of the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor*: Account of that Invective against Milton, with specimens: Alexander Morus reputed to be the Author: Antecedents of Morus: His connexion with Salmasius: Scandal about Morus: Gossip on the subject from the Vossius-Heinsius Correspondence: The Printer Adrian Ulac and his Overtures to Milton: Death of Milton's Wife: Letter to Richard Heath: John Phillips's *Responsio ad Apologiam Anonymi Cujusdam* in behalf of his Uncle: Account of the Pamphlet: More Gossip about Salmasius, Morus, and Milton, from the Vossius-Heinsius Correspondence: Heinsius in Italy: Andrew Marvell and his first acquaintance with Milton: Letter from Milton to Bradshaw, recommending Marvell for the Assistant Latin Secretaryship: Failure of the Proposal: Inventory of Milton's Latin State Letters continued (Nos. XX.–XL.): Correspondence with Andrew Sandelands in Scotland 415

BOOK III.

APRIL 1653—SEPTEMBER 1654.

HISTORY:—CROMWELL'S INTERIM DICTATORSHIP AND ELEVATION TO THE PROTECTORATE.

I. THE INTERIM DICTATORSHIP, WITH THE BAREBONES PARLIAMENT: APRIL 1653—DEC. 1653.

II. FIRST NINE MONTHS OF OLIVER'S FIRST PROTECTORATE: DEC. 1653—SEPT. 1654.

BIOGRAPHY:—MILTON'S LIFE AND SECRETARYSHIP THROUGH THIS PERIOD.

CHAP. PAGE

I. Cromwell's Interim Dictatorship and the Barebones Parliament: April 20 to Dec. 16, 1653.——General Adhesion to Cromwell after his Dissolution of the Rump: His Interim Council of Thirteen and its Proceedings: His Summons of a Supreme Convention or Assembly of Notables for England, Scotland, and Ireland: Another Victory over the Dutch: Reappearance of John Lilburne: Meeting of the Supreme Assembly, July 4: It takes form as the Little or Barebones Parliament: New Council of State: High Promise of the Barebones Parliament: Yet another Victory over the Dutch: The last of Lilburne in public: Commotions in Scotland: Dispersion of the General Assembly in Edinburgh, and Prohibition of future Assemblies: Acts of the Barebones Parliament as far as Nov. 1653: Appointment of a new Council of State in that month: Whitlocke's Embassy to Sweden: A Radical Party and a Conservative Party even in the Barebones Parliament: The real Question that of Tithes and an Established Church: Equal balance of the Parties in this Question: Vote of Dec. 10 and dead-lock in consequence: Cromwell in sympathy with the Conservatives: Break-up of the Parliament by Speaker Rous and Resurrender of its trust to Cromwell: Establishment of the Protectorate . 497

II. Milton's Life and Secretaryship from April 20 to Dec. 16, 1653. ——Milton's approval of Cromwell's *coup d'état*: A Printed Letter of his on the subject, addressed probably to Marvell: Extracts: Traces of Milton in the Minutes of Cromwell's Interim Council and in those of the two Councils of the Barebones Parliament: His Position now virtually that of Latin Secretary Extraordinary, with Philip Meadows for his substitute: Four more State Letters of Milton (Nos. XLI.–XLIV.): Renewed Intercourse between Milton and Roger Williams during Williams's stay in England: Correspondence between Williams and Mrs. Sadleir: That Lady's opinion of Williams and also of Milton: Extracts from a Letter of Williams to John Winthrop: Milton's Translations of Psalms I.–VIII.: Publication of three more Tracts against Milton, two of them by German Jurists: The Real Rowland: Last Days and Death of Salmasius: Letter of Heinsius on receipt of the News: Milton's Reply to the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor* in progress at last . . . 519

III. First Nine Months of Oliver's First Protectorate: Dec. 16, 1653 to Sept. 3, 1654.——Cromwell's change of Title: Constitution of the Protectorate by the instrument called *The Government of the Commonwealth*: Powers of the Lord Protector: His Council:

CHAP. PAGE

Provision for future Parliaments: List of Oliver's Council: Officers of the Council and Forms of its Meetings.—Opponents of the Protectorate: Anabaptist Discontents and Stuartist Plots: Letter of Roger Williams about Harrison, Vane, and others: The Gerard-Vowel Conspiracy: Reception of the Protectorate in Ireland and in Scotland: Ludlow's Dissent in Ireland: Return of Monk to Scotland: Wavering of Colonel Overton: Peace with the United Provinces: Treaties with Sweden, Portugal, Denmark, France, and Spain: Oliver's impressive Style with Foreign Powers: The De Baas Incident and the Case of Don Pantaleon Sa: Legislative Energy of the Protector and his Council: List of their first Ordinances: The Protectorate avowedly from the first a creation in the interests of Conservatism, and especially for the Conservation of an Established Church and the Universities: Farther Proofs of this: An Established Church and Toleration out of it the two fixed-ideas of Cromwell in his Protectorate: The Ordinance for a Commission of Triers and that for a Commission of Ejectors: The Lord Protector at home: Ceremonial of his Court 541

IV. Milton's Life and Secretaryship through the First Nine Months of Oliver's First Protectorate: Dec. 1653 to Sept. 1654.—— Revision of the Council Establishment under Thurloe: Milton's Services retained.—A lull of six months in his Secretaryship: Publication of his *Defensio Secunda*, May 1654: Account of the Book: Its Exposure of Morus and his antecedents, and Attacks on Ulac and on the Memory of Salmasius: Historical and Autobiographical Passages: The Panegyric on Queen Christina of Sweden: The Panegyrics on Bradshaw, Fairfax, Fleetwood, Lambert, Overton, and others: The Grand Panegyric on Cromwell: Examination of Milton's relations to the Protector and his Government: Milton an ardent Oliverian, but with Reserves: Nature of the Reserves: Significance of his Praises of Bradshaw and Overton: His Notions of Political Liberty: His Cautions to Cromwell against Arbitrariness, Over-Legislation, and a Policy of Repression: His Dislike of Cromwell's Established Church.—Presentation Copies of the *Defensio Secunda*: Andrew Marvell again: His Tutorship, by Cromwell's appointment, to young Mr. Dutton, and Residence with his pupil in the family of the Oxenbridges at Eton: His Letter thence to Milton about the *Defensio Secunda*, and the delivery of one of the Presentation Copies in particular: Marvell's Latin Verses on Cromwell's Portrait: Cyriack Skinner now much with Milton: Henry Oldenburg: Milton's Letter to him: Doubts at last as to Morus's Authorship of the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor*: History of Morus since the appearance of that book: His Alarm on hearing of the *Defensio Secunda* as forthcoming, and his Efforts through the Dutch Ambassador to stop the publication: His Horror when copies reached Holland: Reception of the Book there: Ulac's Project of a Foreign edition of it, to be bound up with a Reply from Morus: Complimentary mention of the Greek Philaras in the *Defensio Secunda*: Difficulties of Philaras in Paris: His Visit to London and Call on Milton: Letter of Milton to Philaras on the subject of his blindness . . 574

BOOK I.

JANUARY 1648-9—JULY 1649.

HISTORY:—FOUNDATION AND BEGINNINGS OF AN ENGLISH REPUBLIC.

BIOGRAPHY:—MILTON'S ADHESION TO THE REPUBLIC: HIS *TENURE OF KINGS AND MAGISTRATES*: COMMENCEMENT OF HIS LATIN SECRETARYSHIP.

58

THE LIFE OF JOHN MILTON,

WITH THE

HISTORY OF HIS TIME.

CHAPTER I.

FOUNDATION AND BEGINNINGS OF AN ENGLISH REPUBLIC.

ENGLAND was now a Republic. The change had been virtually made on Thursday, January 4, 1648–9, when the Commons passed their three great Resolutions, declaring (1) that the People of England were, under God, the original of all just power in the State, (2) that the Commons, in Parliament assembled, having been chosen by the People, and representing the People, possessed the supreme power in their name, and (3) that whatever the Commons enacted should have the force of a law, without needing the consent of either King or House of Peers.[1]

On Tuesday, the 30th of January, the theory of these Resolutions became more visibly a fact. On the afternoon of that day, while the crowd that had seen the execution in front of Whitehall were still lingering round the scaffold, the Commons passed an Act "prohibiting the proclaiming of any person to be King of England or Ireland, or the dominions thereof." It was thus declared that Kingship in

---

[1] Ante, Vol. III. p. 704.

England had died with Charles. But what of the House of Peers? It was significant that on the same fatal day the Commons revived their three theoretical resolutions of the 4th, and ordered them to be printed. The wretched little rag of a House might then have known its doom. But it took a week more to convince them. They had met duly, for one of their miserable sittings, on the day of the King's death, the Earl of Denbigh in the chair, and the Earls of Pembroke, Mulgrave, and Kent, with Lord Grey of Wark, forming the House. On Thursday, the 1st of February, these five met again, Lord Howard of Escrick also present; and then they emitted a small flicker of life. On a motion to "take into consideration the settlement of the Government of England and Ireland in this present conjunction of things upon the death of the King," it was ordered that the six Lords present, with the Earls of Salisbury and Nottingham, and Lord Montague of Boughton, should be a Committee of the House "to join with a proportionable number of the House of Commons" for deliberating the great question and "reporting their results to the respective Houses." As usual, messengers were sent to the Commons to ask their concurrence. Next day, six Peers again present, it was reported that the messengers had not been admitted. Even then the House would not despair. They held three more meetings—Saturday the 3rd, Monday the 5th, Tuesday the 6th. At the meeting of the 5th the Earl of Northumberland was added to the Committee of nine Peers appointed on the 1st, and the application to the Commons was renewed. The proceedings of the next day, Tuesday, February 6, will be best given in the words of the Journals of the House:—

> "Die Martis, 6° die Februarii. Prayers by ——. *Domini præsentes fuerunt—Comes* Denbigh, Speaker, *Comes* Northumb., *Comes* Kent, *Comes* Pembroke, *Comes* Salisbury, *Comes* Nottingham. It appearing to this House that Mr. Scholoer, by agreement, hath made a resignation of the Church and Rectory of Ould in Com. Northampton, it is Ordered that the Order of this House of the 23rd of June, 1645, for Mr. Scholoer to officiate there is hereby taken off and revoked, and left to the Commissioners of the Great Seal to dispose of the said Rectory. House adjourned till 10 *cras*."

When ten o'clock next morning came, the Lords were not there. That memorandum about a vacant Northamptonshire Rectory was to be the last act done by a House of Lords in England for many a year. By the will of the Commons then sitting it would have been the last for ever. On the 5th they had been debating whether a House of Lords should be continued in any form; and on the 6th the debate had been resumed in the form of the question "That this House shall "take the advice of the House of Lords in the exercise of "the legislative power." For the *No* there voted forty-four members, with Henry Marten and Lord Grey of Groby for their tellers, and for the *Yea* there voted twenty-nine, with Colonels Purefoy and Sydenham for their tellers; and, the question having thus passed in the negative, it was accordingly resolved by the whole House "That the House of Peers in "Parliament is useless and dangerous, and ought to be "abolished, and that an Act be brought in to that purpose." Next day, Feb. 7, after another long debate, it was further resolved "That it hath been found by experience, and this "House doth declare, that the office of a King in this realm, "and to have the power thereof in any single person, is unnecessary, burdensome, and dangerous to the liberty, safety, "and public interest of the People of this nation, and therefore ought to be abolished, and that an Act be brought in "to that purpose." Not till after some weeks were these Acts deliberately passed after the customary three readings. The delay, however, was matter of mere Parliamentary form. Theoretically a Republic since Jan. 4, 1648-9, and visibly a Republic from the day of Charles's death, England was a Republic absolutely and in every sense from Feb. 7, 1648-9.[1]

---

[1] Commons and Lords Journals of the days named and over the time described; and Whitlocke for Feb. 5, 6, and 7.

CONSTITUTION OF THE NEW REPUBLIC: PRECONCEPTIONS ON THE SUBJECT: IRETON'S DRAFT *AGREEMENT OF THE PEOPLE.*—CREATION OF A COUNCIL OF STATE: COMPOSITION OF THE FIRST COUNCIL: ITS FIRST MEETINGS AND DIFFICULTIES: CROMWELL'S PARAMOUNT ACTIVITY.—FORMS AND ROUTINE OF THE COUNCIL.

Republics, however, may be of different sorts. What was the exact constitution of the new English Republic of Feb. 1648–9, and what were to be its machinery and methods? At that date the men themselves who had set up the Republic could not have answered the question. They had made their grand leap in the dark, and had to feel their way gradually towards a constitution that would suit.

There were, indeed, preconceptions on the subject. Men who had been looking forward to an English Republic for months could not but have been meditating a probable constitution for it, whether after the model of this or that other Republic already celebrated in history, or on principles of more general theory, as applied to the needs and traditions of English life. There may have been hundreds of such men among the civilians of England; but for several years past, as we know, the great nursery of political speculation had been the Parliamentarian Army. Now, as it was this Army that had brought about the Republic, and that still presided over its formation, whence but from the same Army could instructions in detail be expected? Had any such been furnished?

Certainly not in the *Grand Army Remonstrance* of Nov. 16, 1648, under the banner of which all the chief subsequent events, from Pride's Purge to the arrangements for the King's trial, had been openly enacted. That document (Vol. III. pp. 616–619) had prescribed the "right way" so far. It had demanded the trial and punishment of the King, and then the speedy dissolution of the existing Parliament, after security had been taken for a future series of annual or biennial Parliaments, to be chosen by a reformed electorate.

No further than this, in the way of prefiguration of the coming Republic, had that great document gone. It had been hinted, however, in the body of the document, that an Appendix of more precise particulars might be forthcoming. Accordingly, on the 20th of Jan., 1648–9, when all the real virtue of the general document had been exhausted, the Army having been then more than six weeks in London, and the Parliament having been shaped to its pleasure, and the trial of the King having begun, the promised Appendix had come forth. *Agreement of the People of England, and the Places therewith incorporated, for a secure and present Peace upon grounds of common Right, Freedom, and Safety:* such is the title of a paper delivered that day to the Commons by Lieutenant-General Hammond, Colonel Okey, and other deputies from the Army, together with an explanatory Petition, dated "Whitehall, Jan. 15." Both the Paper and explanatory Petition are signed, as the Grand Remonstrance itself had been, by the Army Secretary, John Rushworth, in the name and by the authority of his Excellency Lord General Fairfax and his General Council of Officers. It is, therefore, the Army collectively that speaks.

What do they say? "Because our former overtures," they say in the explanatory Petition, "being only in general terms, "and not reduced to a certainty of particulars fit for practice, "might possibly be understood but as plausible pretences, not "intended really to be put into effect, we have thought it our "duty to draw out these generals into an entire frame of par"ticulars, ascertained with such circumstances as may make "it effectively practicable; and, for that end, while your time "hath been taken up in other matters of high and present "importance, we have spent much of ours in preparing and "perfecting such a Draft of Agreement, and in all things so "circumstantiated, as to render it ripe for your speedier con"sideration, and the kingdom's acceptance and practice, if "approved: and so we do herewith humbly present it to "you." What they thus present is called *An Agreement of the People,* they add, rather in anticipation of what it may become than in description of what it already is. It is certainly an expression of the views of the Army; they hope also it will be approved by Parliament, at least in essentials; but they think that, after that, it should be immediately circulated among the people in all parts of the country, so as to form the matter of a general Plebiscite of the well-affected. The Paper itself provides very punctually the means of taking such a Plebiscite; but, for the rest, it is a draft, in ten Articles, of a new Republican Constitution for England:—Article I clears the way by demanding the dissolution of the existing Parliament on or before the last day of April, 1649. Article II, assuming that the supreme power in England is thenceforth to be in a single Representative House, declares that every such future Representative House shall consist of four hundred members, or not more, and gives a table or map of the fairest possible distribution of these among the shires, cities, and boroughs of England and Wales. In this table, or scheme of a redistribution of seats, Yorkshire stands highest, with twenty members for shire, city, and boroughs; Devonshire comes next, with seventeen in all; Middlesex, with London and Westminster, is to have fourteen; Cornwall, with all her boroughs, so enormously over-represented hitherto, is reduced to eight; Wiltshire to the same number; to Lancashire, with Manchester and boroughs, the number assigned is seven; to Buckinghamshire and boroughs six; and so proportionately throughout, with but one member each for such small counties as Rutland and Flint. Article III provides that the general elections shall be biennial, on the first Thursday of every second May, and that every "Representative,"—the name given throughout the document to the Parliament or Representative House,—is to meet on the second Thursday of the June following its election, and to sit from that date not longer than six months. It also specifies the qualifications of the electors and the eligible. The electors are to be all men of full age and householders, except paupers, and (for the first seven years) armed adherents of the King in the late wars and insurrections. The eligible are to be those qualified as electors, with certain farther restrictions, tending to keep out, for the first few Parliaments, men of dubious antecedents. It is a singular provision that any lawyer elected must discontinue practice during the period of his Parliamentary trust. By Article IV it is settled that no legislative vote or binding enactment shall pass in the Representative House if less than 150 members are present, but that for mere debates or resolutions sixty members may make a House. Article V is very important. It requires every future Parliament, within twenty days after its first meeting, to appoint a COUNCIL OF STATE, to be the acting Ministry or Government, in co-operation with itself, and also in the interval between it and the next Parliament. To this Council of State Article VI gives the power of convoking, if necessary, special short Parliaments in the eighteen months of interval between each regular Parliament and its regular successor. Article VII prohibits the appointment of any member of Parliament, during his trust, to any public office, other than a seat in the Council of State. Article VIII confers on future Parliaments the supreme power and right of judgment "concerning all natural or civil things, but not concerning "things spiritual or evangelical." It reserves, however, six particulars, "even in things natural and civil," which are to be beyond the power of Parliament, and to depend on prior and fundamental law. In Article IX the power of Parliaments in the religious question is more expressly defined. Christianity, it is hoped, is to be the permanent national religion, and the purer the better; Parliament may establish and endow any form of Church, not Popish or Prelatic; Dissenters from the Established Church are nevertheless to be tolerated and protected in their separate worship, except that "it is not "intended to be hereby provided that this liberty shall necessarily extend to Popery or Prelacy"; and all laws or enactments inconsistent with the religious liberty so guaranteed are to be regarded as repealed and void. Article X outlaws and declares guilty of treason any who may resist by arms the orders of future Parliaments acting within the powers conferred upon them by the Agreement.—There is then a final paragraph, declaring that the Army accepts all the items of the Agreement, but distinguishing between those it holds to be essential and those it propounds merely as convenient. Among these last are "the particular circumstances "of numbers, times, and places expressed in the several "Articles." This must mean, among other things, that, though the Army earnestly desired the dissolution of the existing Parliament on or before the last day of April, 1649, so that the first general election under the Republic might be in May, they would not insist on these exact dates, should there be reason for delay.[1]

Tabled in the House of Commons in the name of Fairfax and his General Council of Officers, this *Agreement of the People*, it is worth remembering, had been framed mainly by Cromwell's son-in-law Ireton. It is one more of those Army papers from the pen of this lawyer-soldier which strike us yet as the supreme public documents of their time for weight, insight, and constructive ability. The Army, we have said, was the nursery of all that was best in the political thought of England at that day; but probably the most definite doctrinaire, the most inventive political thinker of the formal or didactic kind, in the whole Army, was Commissary-general Ireton. One knows not how far he had hitherto been shaping the opinions of his colleagues to his own, or how far he had permitted theirs, and especially Cromwell's, to shape his. Nevertheless, as the draftsman of a document can always put something of himself into it, which survives the revisions and alterations of those who nominally adopt it, Ireton's great documents, though they went into the world as authorized by Fairfax, Cromwell, and the rest of the Army-chiefs, might yet be taken as, in some respects, more Ireton's than theirs. So particularly with this draft *Agreement of the People.* Though one may detect in it clauses in which Ireton must have deferred to opinions less advanced than his own—e.g.

---

[1] For the *Agreement of the People* and the accompanying Petition at large see Parl. Hist. III. 1261—1277. This *Agreement of the People* of Jan. 1648—9 is not to be confounded with the previous *Agreement of the People* put forth by the democratic Army Agitators in Nov. 1647 (see Vol. III. pp. 571, 583). It is very significant, however, that the name of that long-suppressed document was now revived, and still more significant that its main ideas and some of its very phrases were reproduced in the later document. Proposals that had been put down as premature or anarchical by the Army chiefs in 1647 had now mounted into their own manifesto.

the hesitating one as to the extension of religious liberty to Papists and Episcopalians, which after all he ingeniously contrives to leave an open question—yet even those in whose name the document appeared may have talked of it among themselves as chiefly Ireton's.—This may account for its treatment by the Commons on the day on which it was presented. Profuse thanks were returned to Lord General Fairfax and the Officers of the Army for both the *Agreement* and the explanatory Petition; the latter was read and ordered to be printed; but the *Agreement*, as being long, was not read, but only reserved for consideration. It was the first day of the King's trial, and the Commons had to adjourn early.[1]

One proposal of Ireton's paper did at once take effect. On Wednesday, Feb. 7, the day on which Kingship was declared abolished, and the day after the House of Peers had been swept away, these orders were passed by the Commons:—"*Ordered*, That the Committee of Safety and the Committee "at Derby House, and the powers to them and either of them "given by any order or ordinance of Parliament, be absolutely "dissolved and taken away;" "*Ordered*, That there be a "COUNCIL OF STATE erected, to act and proceed according to "such instructions as shall be given to them by this House: "Mr. Lisle, Mr. Holland, Mr. Scott, Colonel Ludlow, Mr. "Robinson, to present to this House instructions to be given "to the Council of Estates, and likewise the names of such "persons as they conceive fit to be of the Council of Estates, "not exceeding the number of forty." In other words, the two great Committees that had hitherto exercised under Parliament the chief functions of an Executive were to cease, and a large new Ministry and Executive was to be set up in their room.

Within eight days the arrangements were complete. On the 13th the Instructions to be given to the Council of State were reported and agreed to, these Instructions conferring almost plenary powers, but limiting the duration of the Council to one year. On the 14th thirty-nine of the persons proposed for the Council were appointed one by one, all unanimously except the Earls of Pembroke and Salisbury. In their cases the House divided, and Pembroke was chosen by fifty votes against twenty-five, Salisbury by only twenty-three against twenty, Henry Marten being one of the tellers against in each case. It was proposed to fill up the other two places (for forty-one had come to be the fixed number) by appointing Ireton and Colonel Harrison; but, for some reason, the proposal was negatived without a division, so that Ireton was excluded from the body of his own devising. On the 15th the two vacant places were filled up, and it was also resolved that nine of the Council should be a quorum, and, by a majority of twenty-two to sixteen, that there should be no permanent President. On the same day Gualter Frost, Senior, who had been Secretary to the Committee of Derby House, was appointed Secretary to the new Council.

---

[1] Whitlocke, under dates Jan. 11 and Jan. 20, 1648—9; Commons Journals of latter date.

The first Council of State of the English Republic was then ready for work. It stood as follows, the aristocratic names put first in our arrangement, the others annexed in groups, with the military or official designations appertaining to them, and an asterisk prefixed to the names of those who, as having attended at the King's trial to the last or signed his Death Warrant, were emphatically the "Regicides" of the body:—

Basil Fielding, Earl of Denbigh.
Edmund Sheffield, Earl of Mulgrave.
Philip Herbert, Earl of Pembroke.
William Cecil, Earl of Salisbury.
William, Lord Grey of Wark.
Philip Sidney, Viscount Lisle.
* Thomas, Lord Grey of Groby.
Lord General Fairfax.
* Lieutenant-General Cromwell.
Major-General Skippon.
Sir William Armyn, Bart.
* Sir William Constable, Bart.
Sir Arthur Hasilrig, Bart.
Sir William Masham, Bart.
Sir Gilbert Pickering, Bart.
* Sir John Danvers, Knt.
Sir James Harrington, Knt.
Sir Henry Mildmay, Knt.
Sir Henry Vane, Knt.
Henry Rolle, Chief Justice of the Upper Bench.
Oliver St. John, Chief Justice of the Common Bench.
John Wylde, Chief Baron of the Court of Exchequer.
* John Bradshaw, Serjeant at Law.
* John Lisle, Counsellor at Law.
Bulstrode Whitlocke, Counsellor at Law.
* Colonel John Hutchinson.
* Colonel Edmund Ludlow.
* Colonel Henry Marten.

* Colonel William Purefoy.
* Colonel Valentine Walton.
Dennis Bond, Esq.
* William Heveningham, Esq.
* Cornelius Holland, Esq.
* John Jones, Esq.
Alexander Popham, Esq.
Luke Robinson, Esq.
* Thomas Scott, Esq.
* Anthony Stapley, Esq.
Robert Wallop, Esq.
Alderman Isaac Pennington.
Alderman Rowland Wilson.[1]

The Council of State held its first meeting in Derby House, in Canon Row, Westminster, on Saturday night, Feb. 17. The following is the Minute of the meeting, as it was made at the moment by Mr. Frost, the Secretary:—

"At the Council of State, Derby House, Saturday, 17th Feb. "1648. Present—Lieut. Gen. Cromwell, Sir John Danvers, Lord "Grey of Groby, Col. Marten, Col. Walton, Mr. Robinson, Mr. "Stapley, Sir William Constable, Sir William Masham, Col. "Purefoy, Col. Ludlow, Mr. Scott, Mr. Holland, Mr. Heveningham; "and all these signed the Engagement but Sir William Masham. "*Ordered*, That this Council do meet on Monday morning next by "the hour of nine at Derby House: that the several Lords and "Gentlemen nominated by the Act of Parliament to be of this "Council be desired to meet at Derby House on Monday morning "next by nine of the clock."

From this brief Minute several things appear. It may be perceived, in the first place, that the meeting was formal only, and in order to make a beginning. It may be perceived, in the second place, that there was some difficulty in making the beginning. The first meeting of a new Cabinet or other body of dignitaries is usually a very ceremonious one, attended by all the members; but this was a rapid meeting on a Saturday night, attended by only fourteen out of a body of forty-one. Of these fourteen, it will be further noted, thirteen were Regicides, committed by their very lives to the new system of things, while the only one that was not in this extreme category, Sir William Masham, stood out from the rest by declining to take "the Engagement," i. e. the oath which Parliament had prescribed for the members of the new Council ere they could be installed. Finally, it may be observed that Cromwell's name stands first in the *sederunt*, as if he had taken the chair and directed the meeting.—These impressions are converted into certainty by the Minute of the next meeting, Monday, Feb. 19, and by the record in the *Commons Journals* of the report made by Cromwell to the House of what had passed in the two meetings. The second meeting, indeed, was attended by thirty-four members in all, including, besides the fourteen who had been present at the first, these additional twenty—the Earl of Denbigh, the Earl of Pembroke, the Earl of Salisbury, Lord Grey of Wark, Lord Lisle, Fairfax, Skippon, Sir Arthur Hasilrig, Sir Gilbert Pickering, Sir James Harrington, Sir Henry Mildmay, Colonel Hutchinson, Mr. Lisle, Mr. Whitlocke, Mr. Bond, Mr. Jones, Mr. Popham, Mr. Wallop, Alderman Pennington, and Alderman Wilson. Six of these additional twenty—viz. Sir Henry Mildmay, Colonel Hutchinson, Mr. Lisle, Mr. Jones, Mr. Wallop, and Alderman Pennington—took the Engagement readily, raising the number of those who had taken it to nineteen; but the rest joined Masham in objecting. Lord Grey of Wark, who objected most strongly, did so on the ground that he could not recognise the authority of a single House as constitutional; the others demurred more courteously and gently. They accounted it a great honour to have been nominated to the Council of State, and were willing to accept the new order of things, with the Commons as now the sole supreme power; nay, they would live and die with the new Commonwealth; but there were particular expressions in the Engagement that were too retrospective and might commit them more than they liked to all the steps by which the new order of things had been brought about. The dreadful deed in front of Whitehall was doubtless most in their minds, though what the Peers, Denbigh, Pembroke, and Salisbury, chiefly spoke of was the allegiance they owed to at least the memory of the other

---

[1] Commons Journals, 7th, 13th, 14th, and 15th Feb. 1648—9. In these Journals the names of the members of the Council of State are entered in the mere order in which they were voted on, and the military designations are not attached to the names of the Generals and Colonels. Thus Fairfax is "Thomas, "Lord Fairfax," and Cromwell is "Oliver "Cromwell, Esq." merely. All the forty-one, except the five Peers at the top of our list and the three Judges and Serjeant Bradshaw, were members of the House at the time of their appointment. St. John, who had been a member, had not attended since Oct. 1648. Two of the five Peers, having afterwards consented to be Commoners, now that their own House was abolished, obtained seats. These were Pembroke and Salisbury.

House. All which having been reported to the Commons by Cromwell, the Commons were most gracious and considerate. Lord Grey of Wark, of course, must remain out of the Council; but for the rest the Engagement might be modified as the gentlemen themselves and the Council pleased. And so it was done, and the Council, without Lord Grey of Wark, became an established institution, consisting, according to a classification which I find distinctly made in a contemporary news-pamphlet, of *nineteen* statesmen "approving the King's "execution and the removal of the House of Lords," and *one-and-twenty* not understood as so approving, but only as accepting the facts. The next four meetings, indeed, were attended only by the Regicides and one or two more of the nineteen, such as Mildmay and Pennington; but at a second or afternoon sitting of the Council on Friday, Feb. 23, there were present five-and-twenty in all, including not only the three Earls, Lord Lisle, Fairfax, Hasilrig, and others of the dissentients of Monday, but also Sir Henry Vane the younger, who had been in the background since Pride's Purge, but now returned to public life.—Cromwell, one can see, had managed the whole business. The week between Saturday the 17th, when the Council held its first hurried meeting, and Saturday the 24th, when it held its eighth and was fairly afloat, must have been one of those weeks of extraordinary exertion which were sometimes required of him, when nothing would answer but his own actual going about on a round of calls, seeing this and that eminent doubter, and plying them all fervidly with his wondrous powers of persuasion. We have, in fact, a glimpse of him in his triumphant success at the end of that very week from the diary of one of the doubters he had won over most conspicuously. "From the Council of State," writes Whitlocke under date Feb. 24, 1648–9, "Cromwell and "his son Ireton went home with me to supper, where they "were very cheerful and seemed extremely well pleased. We "discoursed together till twelve o'clock at night; and they "told me wonderful observations of God's providence in the "affairs of the war, and in the business of the Army's coming "to London and seizing the members of the House; in all "which were miraculous passages. As they went home from "my house [Sunday morning begun or close at hand], their "coach was stopped, and they examined by the guards, to whom "they told their names; but the captain of the guards would "not believe them, and threatened to carry these two great "officers to the court of guard. Ireton grew a little angry; "but Cromwell was cheerful with the soldiers, gave them 20*s*., "and commended them and their captain for doing their duty. "And they afterwards confessed that they knew Cromwell and "Ireton well enough, and were more strict with them than "with others, that they might see they were careful of their "duty, which they believed these great men came at this "time purposely to observe." Ireton, though kept out of the Council of State himself, had been assisting Cromwell in his exertions.[1]

The great COUNCIL OF STATE, thus installed in February, 1648–9, as the governing-body of the new English Commonwealth by authority of the Parliament and in conjunction with it, was, with changes among the persons from year to year, to last throughout the whole existence of the Commonwealth proper. Some general account of its forms and methods may therefore be given here.

The place of meeting at first was Derby House; but very soon it was to be transferred to Whitehall, the Parliament having directed preparations for that purpose (Feb. 17), and having added instructions that members of the Council who desired it should have lodgings in the Palace. Two seals, a larger and a smaller, had been made for the Council's use, each with the impression, "The Seal of the Council of State "appointed by the Parliament of England." Most of the members of Council being also members of Parliament, care was taken that the meetings of the two bodies should be at different times. The Council sat generally once a day, from about eight or nine o'clock in the morning; but sometimes there was an afternoon sitting as well. The attendance varied a good deal—generally from ten to eighteen, seldom as high as twenty-five, and very seldom indeed higher; and often, after the meeting had begun with a small *sederunt*, members would drop in later to increase it. Till the 10th of March, 1648–9, there was, as Parliament had thought best, no fixed President, each meeting appointing its own chairman; but on that day the Council resolved to appoint a President for the rest of the year, and chose Serjeant Bradshaw. This was not to prejudice the power of the Council to proceed in Bradshaw's absence if the quorum of nine were present. Bradshaw presided for the first time on Monday, March 12, not having been present at any previous meeting; and he continued for a good while to be styled simply "Mr. Serjeant Bradshaw," though "Lord "President Bradshaw" became afterwards his designation. Mr. Gualter Frost, Junior, had been chosen by the Council, at its fifth meeting, on Feb. 22, as assistant to his father in the Secretaryship; and on the 15th of March, in pursuance of a resolution of the 13th (the second day of Bradshaw's Presidency) to appoint a special "Secretary for the Foreign "Tongues," and to offer the post to Mr. John Milton, that gentleman also became an official of the Council and began to attend its meetings. Four clerks, under Frost and his son, completed the Secretarial staff; Mr. Edward Dendy was Serjeant-at-arms, with eight constables or warrant-officers under him; and there were porters, messengers, etc., besides. Chaplains seem to have been in attendance from the first for prayers at the openings of the meetings; and in course of time regular chaplains were to be appointed. The utmost vigilance was used to secure privacy at the Council meetings. The two Frosts and Milton could be present in the Council-room along with the members; but they were present under the same solemn promise of secrecy that bound the Councillors themselves. The four clerks had their desks in a room apart. There were precautions even as to access to the vicinity of the Council-room. Gradually, as the Council took measure of its work, it resorted, as all such bodies do, to the machinery of standing Committees for different departments of affairs. Variations in the names and number of the Committees occurred from time to time; but at first we hear most of these five—Committee for Army and Ordnance, Committee for Admiralty and Navy, Committee for Ireland, Committee for Private Examinations (Police Inquiries and Arrests), Committee for Negotiations with Foreign Powers. The members were distributed among these Committees, each of which had a chairman, who was the ruling spirit in his department,—Vane, for example, in the Admiralty and Navy Committee, which had also a separate secretary. The whole Council, however, discussed all matters of general import, referring this or that business to its proper Committee, and deciding on reports from the Committees. Nor, all the while, was the proper connexion between the Council and the Parliament forgotten. It was but a walk of a minute or two from Whitehall to St. Stephen's; the members of Council passed daily from the Council-room to the House and from the House to the Council-room; and discussions of the same subjects were almost simultaneous in the two places, the Council either reporting some matter to the House, or the House referring some matter to the Council. On the whole, though the Council, as the more compact body, and as also containing the persons who formed the ruling nucleus of the House, drew most of the real power to itself, the relations were sufficiently harmonious.[1]

---

[1] My notes from the Order Books of the Council of State preserved in the Record office; Commons Journals, Feb. 19, 1648—9; *The Kingdom's Weekly Intelligencer* of date Feb. 22, 1648—9; Whitlocke, under date named. As the Order Books of the Council of State will be one of my chief authorities henceforth, I may here give some account of them. They consist of a great number of MS. volumes, containing what we should now call the Minutes of the Council, as kept most punctually by the Secretary or his deputy. There are, however, two sets of these Order Books—the so-called Draft Order Books, or, as we should now say, Scroll Minute Books, in which the notes of the attendances and proceedings were taken at the moment in the Council-room; and the "Fair Order Books," in which those notes were afterwards written out more legibly. The two sets of books do not differ in any essential, and are generally word for word, or at least sentence for sentence, the same; but, on the principle of getting as close to the original moment of every fact as possible, I preferred making my notes from the Scroll Minute Books. I do not think I was wrong. Not unfrequently, from some peculiar appearance in the handwriting of the Scroll Minutes—some erasure, marginal filling up, or the like—I derived information which I should have missed in the Fair Minutes. These Fair Minutes were consulted by me, however, once or twice, for comparison, and at other times when there was a gap in the series of the Scroll Minute Books. Unfortunately, from the loss of some volumes, there are gaps in both sets.

---

[1] Notes from Order Books of Council; Commons Journals for Feb. 17, 1648—9; Godwin's Commonwealth, III. 180; Bisset's *Omitted Chapters of the History of England* (1864), p. 37 et seq. See also Mrs. Everett Green's instructive Preface to her Calendar of Domestic State Papers for 1649—50. That Calendar, and its successor for 1650, not having appeared till the present volume was wholly written, my references to them need be only at points where they have added anything to the information I had obtained previously from the documents themselves.

Was there any likelihood that Parliament would act farther on the suggestions of Ireton's Draft *Agreement of the People?* Having set up a solid Council of State, might they not proceed to pass Ireton's great Reform Bill, with or without that preliminary of a Plebiscite which Ireton had recommended? It is symptomatic of the state of mind of Parliament on this question that they had themselves given effect to that proposal of Ireton's paper which Ireton meant to come into force only after their dissolution and the election of their successors. They had themselves set up a Council of State, and they had made it annual instead of biennial. This did not indicate any haste to dissolve, or to pass Ireton's Reform Bill. To understand why this should have been the case, we must take a survey of the circumstances in which the infant Republic was placed.

CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE INFANT COMMONWEALTH:—DANGER FROM SCOTLAND: PROCLAMATION OF CHARLES II. THERE BY THE ARGYLE-WARRISTON GOVERNMENT: HATRED OF THE SCOTS TO THE COMMONWEALTH.—DANGER FROM IRELAND: PROCLAMATION OF CHARLES II. THERE BY ORMOND: SMALL HOLD OF THE COMMONWEALTH UPON IRELAND.—COURT OF CHARLES II. AT THE HAGUE: SCOTTISH NEGOTIATIONS AND INTRIGUES THERE: THE MARQUIS OF MONTROSE AGAIN.—SENTIMENTS OF THE VARIOUS FOREIGN POWERS.

On the 5th of February, immediately after the news of the execution of Charles had reached Scotland, the Scots, disdaining the opportunity of converting their own little country also into a Republic, had proclaimed, at the Cross of Edinburgh, the exiled Prince Charles. They had proclaimed him not by the title of King of Scotland only, but by the full style and title of "Charles II., King of Great "Britain, France, and Ireland." An envoy from the Scottish Parliament had at once been despatched to announce the fact to his young Majesty at the Hague, and to convey also a letter from the Commission of the Scottish Kirk. This letter signified the abhorrence with which all Scotland regarded the murder of his father by the English Sectaries, and the hopes entertained that in himself they might soon welcome back one who would be a true friend to Presbyterial Government. A special embassy, consisting of the Earl of Cassilis and two eminent lawyers on the part of Parliament, and the Rev. Mr. Baillie and another minister on the part of the Kirk, was appointed to follow the first envoy, negotiate with Charles, and invite him into Scotland on certain terms.

Here was one danger for the infant English Republic. Was England never to be free from the embarrassment of her contiguity with the Scots? Three times already in the course of ten years they had invaded England. The first invasion (1640) had been just, for it had been in self-defence against the late King's attempts to force them back to Episcopacy; and the effect upon England herself had been one which she might always remember with gratitude. Against their second invasion (1644) nothing could very well be said either, for it had been on invitation, and to assist the English Parliament in the great Civil War; but they had accompanied the benefit with such an importation of their peculiar tempers and crotchets, in the shape of the Covenant, Anti-Toleration, and Presbyterian bigotry, that it was now questioned whether England might not have fared much better without them. The third time (1648) they had entered England positively as enemies of the Parliament, and promoters of a new Civil War, which would have undone all the gain of the first, had not Cromwell crushed them at Preston. And now, not content with making Charles II. their own King—which theoretically they had a right to do, though practically England would have had to take account even of that experiment—what were they threatening but a fourth invasion, with this Charles II. at their head, to impose him also on the English? With any other people the thing would have been inexplicable. Had not Cromwell, after Preston, gone into Scotland and reinstated for them that Argyle or Whig Government which was now in power? Had he not received their thanks, and parted from Argyle, Loudoun, Warriston, and the rest, on a good understanding? Had not this very Argyle Government, in conjunction with the Kirk, been employed ever since in punishing, persecuting, and excommunicating all the real and proved Royalists within the bounds of Scotland, whether the older adherents of Montrose, or the more recent supporters of Hamilton's Engagement? Had not Scottish society been expressly reconstituted by a famous Act, called "The Act of Classes," passed by the Scottish Parliament as lately as January 23, 1648-9, or but a week before the King's death, excluding from Parliament and from all places of political trust, for longer or shorter periods, four defined parts of the population, precisely on account of their complicity or sympathy with Hamilton's enterprise on the King's behalf? Was not this Act, which Argyle and Warriston had prepared and pushed through, the very charter of *their* Government of Scotland, according to their pact with Cromwell? Yet this same Government was itself plotting a new Royalist enterprise, more desperate even than Hamilton's. How had it all happened?—Easily enough! The execution of Charles had driven Scotland mad. When Cromwell had parted from Argyle, the understanding between them can have involved no less than the incapacitation and perpetual imprisonment of Charles by his English subjects; or, if the astute Argyle had guessed more, it had been in silence. But, when the tremendous fact had occurred four months afterwards, and the vision of the beheaded Charles had sent a shudder through Scotland, the revulsion of even the strictest Scottish Presbyterians into the mood of Royalism was immediate and universal. A tendency had recently been observable in some of them, especially after Cromwell's visit to Edinburgh, to more favourable thoughts of the English Independents and Sectaries, and of their policy so far as it concerned only England. All beginnings of such a spirit, however, were now quenched, and the Scottish horror of Independency and Sectarianism of every sort had returned in full force. It was the Army of Sectaries in England that had done the deed of blood, and woe to Scotland if she had dealings now with those miscreants.—Hence the sudden whirl of the Kirk and the Argyle Government together into a movement for Charles II., not in Scotland only, but in all the three kingdoms. If he would but take the Covenant and declare for Presbytery, what would they not do for him? "If his "Majesty may be moved to join with us in this one point," writes Baillie at the moment, "he will have all Scotland "ready to sacrifice their lives for his service." Meanwhile let there be an end of all relations between Scotland and the abomination calling itself the English Commonwealth! That was accordingly done, and in a somewhat vehement fashion. The Earl of Lothian, Sir John Chiesly, and Mr. William Glendinning, the Scottish Commissioners in London who had pleaded so hard for the King's life, and had been waiting on there, unanswered and neglected, during all the subsequent events of February, presented to the English Parliament, on the 24th of that month, a paper in such a strain that the Parliament would not record it in their books, but passed a vote declaring it insolent and scandalous, arrested the three gentlemen as they were embarking at Gravesend, and sent them home by land under military guard.[1]

Another danger was from Ireland. There had been danger from Ireland, indeed, while Charles was yet alive. The Marquis of Ormond had intended to be back in Ireland, as again Lord Lieutenant for the King, in time to head the Irish division of his Majesty's resources in co-operation with Hamilton and his Scots in the second Civil War. He had failed in this, and not till September 29, 1648, when Hamilton had been beaten, and the King's cause ruined in England, had he been able to land at Cork, Prince Rupert with a fleet following him, to command the Irish seas. What it had been possible still to do for his Majesty in Ireland Ormond had since then, however, most effectually done. A union of the Irish Roman Catholics of all varieties with the Protestant Royalists of all varieties was now the main design; and in this, by long negotiation with the Council of the Roman Catholic Confederates at Kilkenny, Ormond had, to a great extent, succeeded. *Articles of Peace made between the Marquis of Ormond for his Majesty, on the one part, and the General Assembly of the Roman Catholics of Ireland on behalf of his Majesty's Roman Catholic Irish subjects, on the other part:* such is the shortened title of an elaborate document, dated January 17, 1648–9, and proclaimed that day by the Marquis from "our Castle of "Kilkenny." By these Articles not only was religious freedom with endowments guaranteed to the Irish Roman Catholics in terms as ample as those of the famous Glamorgan Treaty which Ormond had condemned and disowned three years before,[1] but the political independence of Ireland in all respects was declared and allowed. A Roman Catholic Army of 15,000 foot and 2500 horse, under Roman Catholic Commanders, was to be maintained; and twelve Roman Catholic Representatives, named in the Articles, with Lords Dillon and Muskerry at their head, were to be Trustees for their countrymen, and Assessors with Ormond in his future proceedings. By this Treaty, in fact, as Ormond had induced Lord Inchiquin and the Munster Protestants to agree to it, the Episcopal Protestants of Ireland had coalesced with the Irish Roman Catholics for the purposes of a Royalist alliance.—When the news reached London the King's Trial was going on; and within a fortnight after the Treaty had been made Charles was on the scaffold. But, though the King for whom it had been made could then have no benefit from it, his death helped to strengthen Ormond's hands in labouring for the heir and successor. Among the Presbyterians of Ulster, mostly Scots, the death of Charles caused exactly the same commotion as among the Presbyterians of Scotland itself. They too revolted with horror from the bloody act; they too denounced, with every epithet of execration, the barbarous Sectaries who had done it. From the Presbytery of Belfast, for example, there came forth, under date February 15, 1648–9, a *Necessary Representation*

---

[1] Balfour's Annals, III. 387; Baillie's Letters, III. 66 (Baillie to Spang), 68 (Spang to Baillie), with Appendix in same vol. p. 458 (Letter of Commission of Kirk to Charles II. at the Hague); Commons Journals, Feb. 26; Parl. Hist. III. 1291.

---

[1] Vol. III. p. 519.

of the Present Evils, which was in fact a vow of irreconcileable hatred to the new English Commonwealth and its founders. —Here was a jumble of Irish elements to be managed by Ormond for the advantage of Charles II. The Irish Roman Catholics, in all their loose myriads, won over, and ready to fight, or at least tumultuate, for the new King; the Munster and other Episcopal Protestants annexed to these by overwhelming Royalist sentiment; the Ulster Presbyterians, nominally still aloof, and keeping up their testimony, of course, against Popery and Prelacy, but more furious by far for the moment against the English Regicides and Sectaries: what might not ability and perseverance accomplish with such materials? So reasoning and hoping, Ormond caused Charles II. to be proclaimed "King of England, Scotland, "France, and Ireland," by an order "given at Carrick, Feb. "26, 1648–9," and wrote to Charles at the Hague to urge his coming to Ireland, undertaking the farther discipline of the Island in his Majesty's name till his Majesty did come. But for two obstacles that remained he could have reported the Island already his Majesty's. On the one hand, Owen Roe O'Neile, who had been the best general hitherto of the Roman Catholic Confederates, but who belonged to the Old Native Irish section of that combination, and had adhered to the Papal Nuncio Rinuccini so long as that ecclesiastic had remained in Ireland (Vol. III. pp. 518–520), refused to acquiesce in Ormond's Treaty with the Confederates at Kilkenny, and stood out, with some forces, for extreme native and sacerdotal interests, or for precise interests of his own. On the other hand, the English Commonwealth retained some grasp of Leinster through Colonel Michael Jones, who had been there since June 1647 as Parliamentary Governor of Dublin, and some grasp of Ulster through Colonel Monk and Sir Charles Coote. It was the more annoying to Ormond because, curiously enough, O'Neile and these English Parliamentarians had come to a kind of truce, and could help each other's military arrangements. Ormond, accordingly, made a bold effort to bribe over Jones. In a somewhat bombastic letter, dated "Carrick, March 9, 1648–9," addressed to Jones, he excuses himself for not sooner having made friendly overtures, but expresses his hope that, now that the English Revolutionists have revealed themselves in their true colours, and shown their intention of converting Monarchy into Anarchy—" unless their aim be first to con-" stitute an elective Kingdom, and then, CROMWELL or some " such John of Leyden being elected, by the same force by " which they have thus far accomplished their ends, to estab-" lish a perfect Turkish tyranny "—in these circumstances so clear-sighted a man as Colonel Jones will think it advisable to declare for Charles II., bring his soldiers with him, and secure his reward. Jones's dry reply, dated " Dublin, " March 14," is to the effect that Ormond has mistaken him, and his own duty too, as time will prove.[1]

Whether Charles II. should land in Scotland or in Ireland was the question at the Hague.

In this capital of the Dutch Republic, where Charles was residing as the guest of his brother-in-law, the young Stadtholder, William II. of Orange, there was the strangest gathering around him of family-friends, and of English, Scottish, and Irish refugees. His brother, the Duke of York, was there, besides his celebrated aunt, the ex-Queen of Bohemia. Hyde was there, with Colepepper, old Cottington, and others, formerly of the English Privy Council of Charles I., and now sworn in afresh as a Privy Council for his successor. The Earls of Lanark, Lauderdale, and Callander, were there, with other Scottish fugitives from the wrath of the Argyle Government in consequence of the Engagement. The heroic Montrose, a fugitive of older date, had also arrived, with some of his adherents, lured thither by the prospect of action, after his weary wanderings over northern Europe, and with this wild vow of revenge for his master's death registered to the world:—

> "But, since thy loud-tongued blood demands supplies,
> More than Briareus' hands, than Argus' eyes,

---

[1] Clarendon (one vol. edit.) p. 722; Godwin's Commonwealth, III. 136—142; Carlyle's Cromwell (edit. 1857), II. 43—44; but chiefly Milton's Works (Pickering's Edition), IV. 504—554, where Ormond's *Articles of Peace with the Irish*, the *Representation of the Belfast Presbytery*, Ormond's Letter to Jones, and Jones's Reply, are given in full.

I'll sing thine obsequies with trumpet sounds,
And write thine epitaph in blood and wounds."

At least half the world believed that, if ever such a vow could be fulfilled, it would be by Montrose. For more than a year there had been out in print, from the Paris press, the famous Latin History of his former exploits in Scotland, written by his chaplain, George Wishart, and entitled *De Rebus sub Imperio illustrissimi Jacobi Montisrosarum Marchionis præclare gestis Commentarius;* the book had been widely read on the Continent; and the expectation was general that the man who had done so much for Charles I. in 1644 and 1645 would soon be heard of again in the British Islands in some flaming effort for Charles II.

It was in the midst of this motley crowd that the Earl of Cassilis, the Rev. Mr. Robert Baillie, and the other Commissioners from the Argyle Government and the Kirk, at last (March 27, 1649) presented themselves to negotiate with Charles. Most ludicrous it is to read now the twelve instructions that had been privately given to them before they left home. "You shall be careful to try, so far as you can," so runs the first of them, "what is the King's inclination and "disposition, what are his principles, who are his counsellors, "in whom he most confides, and whose counsels he most "follows; especially how he is grounded in religion; what "countenance he gives, or what affection he bears, to Prelacy, "the Service-book, and the Government, Worship, and Cere-"monies that were in the Kirk of England; and what form "of worship he uses in his family, what ministers he hath "with him, whether he seeks God in private or not." The other instructions are in the same strain. The Commissioners were to prove to his Majesty the consistency of Presbyterial Kirk-government with Monarchy, nay, its helpfulness to the same. They were to show him how the Scottish nation had always kept the right path between the Malignants and the Prelatists on the one hand and the Sectaries on the other. They were to explain to him "in "a discreet way, at fit opportunities," how his father had erred in refusing to see this, and how *he*, coming fresh to the subject, and without previous obligations, might, if he humbled himself for the sins of his House, start accurately at once with God's blessing. To that end they were to inform him duly as to the contents and historical circumstances of the two Covenants—the National Scottish Covenant of 1638, and the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643—and to persuade him to subscribe both, and to promise to establish them, and strict Presbytery, with the Westminster Assembly's Directory of Worship, Confession of Faith, and Catechisms, in all his dominions.

Such was the situation proposed for Charles, in 1649, by the Argyle Government of Scotland. There were well-wishers of his, besides the proposers, who did advise him to accept it. Lauderdale, Lanark, Callander, and the other refugee Scots of the Engagement, were of this mind. They urged that his acceptance of the Covenants and of Presbytery was his only chance with the Scots generally, and not a bad chance either, inasmuch as, once in Scotland and on the way to success, he might rid himself of intolerable conditions. This was also the view of the young Prince of Orange, who took a really affectionate interest in his brother-in-law's cause, and was at great pains, in colloquies with the Scottish Commissioners, to understand the precise nature of those extraordinary Covenants. Advice to the same effect, though with reserves about the Covenants, came from the Queen-mother, Henrietta Maria, at St. Germains, and was urged by Lords Wilmot and Byron, and others from her Court, who had come to the Hague. On the other hand, as was natural, Hyde and the rest of the genuine English Counsellors could not bear the thought of the King's going among the Scots, on terms which would preclude themselves from being in his company. Even professional Church-of-England feeling in the refugee world was alarmed. Dr. Stewart, whom the late King had enjoined his son to consult in all Church matters, was busy; and Bishop Bramhall published at Delft a violent anti-Presbyterian tract, entitled *A Fair Warning to take heed of the Scottish Discipline.* On the whole, much was to be said in favour of an initiative in Ireland.

Only one third course offered itself. It was represented in the Marquis of Montrose. The position of that hero was peculiar. By both parties of his countrymen at the Hague his very presence in the town at that time was regarded as a pollution, and a stop to business. The Commissioners from Argyle and the Kirk had brought express instructions to make it a *sine qua non* that his Majesty should have nothing to do with the excommunicated Arch-traitor "James "Graham," and should dismiss him from his counsels and his presence. That was not surprising; but that Lauderdale, Lanark, and the other exiled Scottish Engagers, themselves under the ban of the Argyle Government, should refuse the society of a fellow-proscript, so illustrious, and with whose deeds the world was still ringing, did surprise Hyde and the English. Yet such was the fact. They would not meet Montrose; they once withdrew from his Majesty's presence rather than be in the same room with him; they explained to Hyde and others that Montrose was "the most bloody "murderer" of the Scottish nation, with whom no true Scotsman could ever associate. Lauderdale especially was furious on the theme, and filled the Hague with his roarings. Not the less, in the midst of all this, did Hyde and the English retain their courteous half-admiration of the baited hero; and, as Prince Rupert was known to be his friend, and the ex-Queen of Bohemia, with a woman's instinct for genius and high daring, singled him out as the one inspired soul of the crisis, he had a hearing for his plans. They were simple enough, only a repetition of his former exploit of 1644. "Try Scotland, your Majesty; try Scotland! Try her, however, neither through the Argyle Government nor through any worthless wreck of the Hamiltonians. Despite appearances, these men are not Scotland, never were Scotland. Try Scotland through *me*! Let *me* land in Scotland, anyhow, anywhere, as your Majesty's representative and with your Majesty's Commission, and the reality will be again seen. Your Majesty *shall* be King in Scotland, and *shall* advance from Scotland into England; but it shall be with no Covenants, no pledges to Presbytery, round your neck. It shall be as a free sovereign among loyal subjects. If, however, Scotland cannot have the sole honour, and there must be a division of the initiative, then Ireland has perhaps immediate advantages. In that case let your Majesty go first to Ireland, and for a time let it be your Majesty and Ormond in Ireland, and myself alone for your Majesty in Scotland."—In some such terms Montrose argued and pleaded, and so the matter hung. The conflict of counsels still continued at the Hague; but Montrose was not dismissed, and the Scottish Commissioners had but very dubious reports to send home. Personally his Majesty was all that could be desired: "one of the most gentle, innocent, "and well-inclined Princes, so far as yet appears, that lives in "the world—a trim person, and of a manly carriage;" but his surroundings were bad, and there were no signs that he would take the Covenant.[1]

How did the various foreign Powers contemplate these proceedings at the Hague? Clarendon has one bitter passage on the subject. Those kings and princes of Christendom, he complains, whom the woeful spectacle of the public death of a brother-king, the Lord's Anointed, might have been expected to strike aghast, and to band together in a union for vengeance on the Regicides, had shown no alacrity in that direction, but were chiefly conspicuous for their readiness to buy from the Regicides the late King's "rich goods and jewels," his "beds, "hangings, and carpets," his rare "medals and pictures." As usual, Clarendon does not trouble himself with dates here, but takes time vaguely in any extent that suits him.[2] More precise inquiry is therefore necessary.

The general result of such inquiry is that, though there was no frantic excitement among the European states and sovereigns over the execution of Charles, yet Continental opinion was decidedly hostile to the infant Commonwealth.

---

[1] Baillie's Letters, III. Appendix, 460—1 (Instructions to the Scottish Commissioners to the Hague), and body of the work, pp. 67—90, where there are Letters from Spang to Baillie, and from Baillie himself after he went to the Hague, giving full and minute accounts of proceedings there. See also Clarendon, pp. 709—711; and Napier's Montrose, pp. 691 et seq., where there are documents about Montrose at the Hague, including letters of the Queen of Bohemia, giving interesting glimpses of the regard in which Montrose was held by that once celebrated lady, the "Queen of Hearts."

[2] Clarendon, p. 699.

Even in the United Dutch Provinces, themselves a Republic after a fashion, and connected with England by close commercial ties, this was the case. Charles II., it is true, was not present in their capital as the public guest of the States, but only as the private guest of the Stadtholder, his kinsman; there were murmurs among the Dutch, it is true, against his continued residence there, and against the Stadtholder's activity for him; there was even, it is true, a party among the Dutch politicians sympathetic with the new system of things in England because they were themselves maintaining the Republican constitution of the Provinces against a visible tendency of the Stadtholderate to sovereignty. In the main, however, the claims of the young Stuart to his father's throne were popular with the Dutch, and it did not seem unlikely that the Dutch Government might be induced to interfere in his behalf.—Over the rest of Europe there were other chances of interference. The great Peace of Westphalia (Oct. 1648) had just put an end to the Thirty Years' War, settling the mutual relations of the various European Powers, modifying the constitution of the German Confederacy, entitling each State in it to make foreign alliances on its own account, and recognising also formally, for the first time, the independence of the Dutch Provinces and of Switzerland. The Continent was therefore more at leisure than it had been to attend to affairs in the British Islands, and individual powers were more free to interfere if they thought fit. Mazarin, the supreme minister of France during the monarchy of Louis XIV., had hitherto been proof against all the efforts of Henrietta Maria to induce him to do more than allow France to be an asylum for herself and the English Royalist refugees; and he had recently resisted in the same way the importunities of Montrose. But Mazarin's views of policy might change; his Government was trembling under the attacks of its domestic enemies, the Frondeurs; who knew what might happen? Spain and Portugal were farther off,—Spain under Philip IV., and Portugal under John IV., the founder of the Braganza dynasty. Neither of these had given much sympathy to Charles I. in his troubles; and Alonzo de

Cardenas, the Spanish Ambassador in London, had always kept himself on good terms with the Parliamentarians. News, however, had come to the Hague that the Spanish Court was not likely to let its policy towards England be swayed any longer by the counsels of Cardenas. At Madrid, it was said, the death of Charles had been heard of with "passion and indignation;" the King and the whole Court had gone into solemn mourning; the King had spoken with much tenderness and compassion of the exiled young heir to the English throne, and of the propriety of sending him an embassy. It had, accordingly, occurred to old Lord Cottington at the Hague that he and Hyde should be sent together into Spain, to cultivate these favourable dispositions. Hyde, as the younger man, would do the real work; and for himself it would be a pleasure to renew acquaintance with a country of which he had fond recollections dating from the time of the Spanish Match Project. He had confided the idea to Hyde, and it was agreed upon between them.—While such hopes were entertained of Spain, and collaterally of Portugal, expectations from the northern Protestant powers were not wanting. The Marquis of Brandenburg (Friedrich Wilhelm, "the Great Elector," great-grandfather of Frederick the Great of Prussia) was thought likely to assist; others of the German States were thought likely; and there were hopes from Queen Christina of Sweden and Frederick III. of Denmark. Montrose, who had recently made a round of visits among these northern courts, German and Scandinavian, had considerable faith in his power of rousing them to action, and had already marked out Hamburg as a place of rendezvous and embarkation for any forces or supplies they might yield.[1]

Scotland having thus proclaimed and invited Charles II., Ormond in Ireland having proclaimed and invited him, and almost all the European States looking on his cause with sympathy, the fortunes of the infant English Commonwealth depended solely, we may say, on England herself. If the population of England were unanimous for the new Commonwealth, it might stand against a whole adverse world; if they were not unanimous, how could it subsist?

---

[1] Clarendon, 714 et seq., 739 et seq.; Baillie, III. 89; Godwin, III. 352—354; Napier's Montrose, 670—672. Very curious details as to the wavering disposition and conduct of the Spanish Court towards the infant English Republic after the death of Charles I. are to be gathered from documents (from the Simancas Archives) appended to Guizot's *History of Cromwell and the English Commonwealth.*

OPPOSITION TO THE COMMONWEALTH WITHIN ENGLAND: STRENGTH AND INTENSITY OF ENGLISH ROYALISM: THE *EIKON BASILIKE* AND ITS EFFECTS: ROYALIST PAMPHLETS AND NEWSPAPERS: MARCHAMONT NEEDHAM AND THE *MERCURIUS PRAGMATICUS*.

To say that England herself was far from unanimous for the Republic would be ludicrously short of the truth. England herself, if by England we mean the numerical majority of her inhabitants, would have torn down the Republic with her own hands. It had been set up by about sixty men of iron at the centre, representing the Army, and perhaps a third of the general population. If we add the indifferents, who had accepted the Republic as a *fait accompli*, the opponents of the Republic within England herself were still largely in the majority. Had Ireton's plebiscite been tried, and none excluded, this would have been found out. The Army, the Independents, the Sects, thousands and thousands of thoughtful men throughout England, with a great following of those whom the Royalists called the rag-tag of society, would certainly have voted for the Republic. With many of them it was a dream realized, a new heaven and a new earth, a possession worth dying for, the beginning of a Reign of the Saints. But with what masses of diverse substance all over England was this minority mixed! There were, in the first place, the old Episcopalian Royalists, consisting of all of the suppressed Peerage that had not gone into exile, and of the families of such, together with the ejected Anglican bishops and clergy, many of the remaining clergy who were still Anglican at heart, and numberless knights and squires, cherishing in their country houses their old faith and loyal memories, and maintaining the same among the yeomanry and the tenantry. More numerous still were the Presbyterians, the established religious denomination of the land, strong in London and in other cities and towns, and now the more ardent in their Royalism out of remorse for their past ruthlessness in that struggle with the King which had ended so tragically. Theological antipathy mingled with their political bitterness. They hated the chiefs of the Commonwealth, not only as the murderers of the King, but also as the unabashed patrons of heresy and religious toleration. Add these Presbyterians to the Royalists of the old school, and imagine the latent Roman Catholics dispersed among both, and it will be seen what a vast proportion of the population of England were submissive to the new powers only because they were compelled and silenced.

A book, published with great secrecy, and in very mysterious circumstances, Feb. 9, 1648–9, exactly ten days after the late King's death, had done much to increase the Royalist enthusiasm. Εἰκὼν Βασιλική: *The True Portraicture of His Sacred Majestie in his Solitudes and Sufferings.—Rom.* viii. *More than conquerour, &c.—Bona agere et mala pati Regium est.—MDCXLVIII:* such was the title-page of this volume (of 269 pages of text, in small octavo), destined by fate, rather than by merit, to be one of the most famous books of the world. No printer's or publisher's name appeared in the first copies ; but there was a prefixed allegoric design by the engraver William Marshall. It exhibited the well-known person of the late King, kneeling in robes, in a room or chapel, at a table, on which was the Bible, his royal crown tumbled off and lying on the floor, but a crown of thorns in his right hand, and his eye directed upwards to a crown of glory shining overhead. In the background was a kind of landscape, with trees, and a raging sea behind, with angels blowing at the waterspouts ; and scattered through the design were many verbal mottos, such as "*Clarior e tenebris*," "*Crescit sub pondere virtus*," "*In verbo tuo spes mea.*"

The book, so elaborately prepared and heralded, consists of twenty-eight successive chapters, purporting to have been written by the late King, and to be the essence of his spiritual autobiography in the last years of his life. Each chapter, with scarcely an exception, begins with a little narrative, or generally rather with reflections and meditations on some passage of the King's life the narrative of which is supposed to be unnecessary, and ends with a prayer in italics appropriate to the circumstances remembered. Thus Chapter I. is entitled "*Upon his Majesty's calling this last Parliament*," and consists of a narrative and prayer on that subject; Chapter II. is "*Upon the Earl of Strafford's Death*," and gives his Majesty's meditations and compunctions on that event, with a prayer to correspond; and so on the book goes, meditation and prayer, through all the more critical junctures of the King's history from 1640 or 1641 to near his death. One notes a singular absence of dates or other indications by which it could be known whether any particular meditation and prayer were written at the moment of the juncture to which they refer or afterwards in recollection of it, and also a kind of hurry or huddling-up at the end, where there is the nearest approach to precision in this respect, and where there is most of pathos. Thus it is not till Chapter XXIII. that we are at Holmby, or the commencement of the King's real captivity in Feb. 1646–7, and then, after three chapters devoted to his experiences there—the last of them specially entitled "*Penitential Meditations and Vows in the King's Solitude at Holmby*"—there remain but three chapters for all the rest of the "solitude," from June 1647 onwards. In these closing chapters, however, as we have said, the strain becomes most pathetic. The last chapter but one, which is pretty long, is addressed "*To the Prince of Wales*." It begins: "Son, if "these papers, with some others, wherein I have set down "the private reflections of my conscience, and my most im"partial thoughts touching the chief passages which have "been most remarkable or disputed in my late troubles, come "to your hands, to whom they are chiefly designed, they "may be so far useful to you as to state your judgment aright "in what hath passed, whereof a pious is the best use can be "made, and they may also give you some directions how to "remedy the present distempers, and prevent, if God will, the "like for time to come. It is some kind of deceiving and "lessening the injury of my long restraint when I find my "leisure and solitude have produced something worthy of "myself and useful to you, that neither you nor any other "may hereafter measure my cause by the success, nor my "judgment of things by my misfortunes." Then come advices to the Prince, one of which is as follows:—"If you never see "my face again, and God will have me buried in such a barbarous imprisonment and obscurity (which the perfecting "some men's designs requires), wherein few hearts that love "me are permitted to exchange a word or a look with me, I "do require and entreat you, as your Father and your King, "that you never suffer your heart to receive the least check "against, or disaffection from, the true religion established in "the Church of England." Again, there is this passage:—"When they have destroyed me (for I know not how far God "may permit the malice and cruelty of my enemies to proceed, and such apprehensions some men's words and actions "have already given me), as I doubt not but my blood will "cry aloud for vengeance to heaven, so I beseech God not to "pour out his wrath upon the generality of the people, who "have either deserted me or engaged against me through "the artifice and hypocrisy of their leaders; whose inward "horror will be their first tormentor, nor will they escape exemplary judgments." The chapter ends thus:—"At worst, "I trust I shall but go before you to a better kingdom, which "God hath prepared for me, and me for it, through my "Saviour Jesus Christ; to whose mercies I commend you and "all mine. Farewell, till we meet, if not on earth, yet in "heaven." These passages would certainly date the chapter as written in the Isle of Wight; and accordingly the last chapter of all is expressly entitled "*Meditations upon Death,* "*after the Votes of non-Addresses* [Jan. 1647–8] *and His* "*Majesty's closer imprisonment in Carisbrook Castle.*" Here the anticipations of a violent end are precise. Thus, in one passage:—"I confess it is not easy for me to contend with "those many horrors of death wherewith God suffers me to be "tempted; which are equally horrid either in the suddenness "of a barbarous assassination, or in those greater formalities "whereby my enemies, being more solemnly cruel, will, it "may be, seek to add, as those did who crucified Christ, the "mockery of Justice to the cruelty of Malice." He is resigned, however, to his lot, and the conclusion of the appended prayer is the language of a martyr about to be beatified:—"When their hands shall be heaviest and cruelest "upon me, O let me fall into the arms of Thy tender and "eternal mercies, that what is cut off of my life in this miser-"able moment may be repaired in Thy ever-blessed eternities. "Lord, let thy servant depart in peace, for my eyes have "seen Thy salvation."[1]

Save for a few such passages as we have quoted, the pathos of which lies in the situation they represent, the '*Eikon Basilike*' is a rather dull performance, in third-rate rhetoric, modulated after the Liturgy, and without incision, point, or the least shred of real information as to facts. But O what a reception it had! Copies of it ran about instantaneously, and were read with sobs and tears. It was in vain that Parliament, March 16, gave orders for seizing the book. It was reprinted at once in various forms, to supply the constant demand—which was not satisfied, it is said, with less than fifty editions within a single year; it became a very Bible in English Royalist households. There were copies of it at the Hague by the 3rd of April, 1649, if not earlier; and a Latin translation and a French translation were in preparation for circulation over the Continent. By means of this book, in fact, acting on the state of sentiment which it fitted, there was established, within a few weeks after the death of Charles I., that marvellous worship of his memory, that passionate recollection of him as the perfect man and the perfect king, the saint, the martyr, the all but Christ on earth again, which persisted till the other day as a positive religious *cultus* of the English mind, and still lingers in certain quarters. Marshall, as the engraver of the wondrous allegorical frontispiece, was perhaps entitled to a share of the credit. He had succeeded better in this than in that portrait of Milton, for the 1645 edition of his Poems, for which Milton had punished him so savagely in his Greek epigram.[1]

---

[1] I ascertain the date of the first appearance of the *Eikon Basilike* from Thomason's copy in the British Museum, which has "Feb. 9th," in MS., on the title-page. My own copy is one of a later issue, still with no publisher's name, but with "Reprinted in R. M. "An. Dom. 1648" at the foot of the title-page.

We have spoken of the opponents of the New Government as "silenced." The publication of the *Eikon Basilike* (which was followed soon by the publication of *The Papers which passed at Newcastle betwixt his sacred Majesty and Mr. Alexander Henderson*) shows that this was true only in a limited sense; and there is other evidence, in extraordinary quantity, that Royalism asserted its unabated strength, and now fiercer intensity, through the press. "*A Handkerchief for Loyal Mourners*"; "*The Subjects' Sorrow: or Lamentation upon the Death of Britain's Josiah, King Charles, in a Sermon on Lam. IV. 20, by Dr. Juxon, Bishop of London*"; "*The Devilish Conspiracy, Hellish Treason, Heathenish Condemnation, and Damnable Murder, committed and executed by the Jews against the Anointed of the Lord Jesus Christ, their King: as it was delivered in a sermon, Feb. 4, by Dr. Warner, Bishop of Rochester*":—such are the titles of three specimens of a Royalist pamphlet-literature that was now abundant. Nor must it be forgotten that the day of regular newspapers, after a humble fashion, had arrived, and that every week in London there were hawked about copies of many different news-sheets of small quarto size, all of them unlicensed, and some of them Royalist. Chief among the Royalist news-sheets at this date was the *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, edited by Marchamont Needham.

This Marchamont Needham, one of the first of English journalists that can now be distinctly named, had had a varied and rather discreditable history. Born in Oxfordshire in 1620, and educated at All Souls', Oxford, where he took his B.A. degree, he had come to London at the age of eighteen to be usher in Merchant Taylors' School, but had left that place for more profitable employment as a clerk, or lawyer's assistant, in Gray's Inn. In Aug. 1643, or a year after the beginning of the Civil War, while still not more than three-and-twenty years of age, he had made a great stroke in life by starting the *Mercurius Britannicus*, a newspaper on the popular side, in opposition to the *Mercurius Aulicus*, conducted at Oxford by John Birkenhead and others on the King's side. He threw into it some wit, and a great deal of scurrility and invective against the King and the Royalists, sacrificing all, says Anthony Wood, to "the beast with many heads." He became, accordingly, a great favourite with the Londoners, and seems even to have been employed occasionally in hack-work for the Parliament. In 1645, having studied physic, "in the chemical way," and begun to practise it, "by that "and his writing he maintained himself in a very genteel "fashion." An imprisonment in the Gatehouse for some offence or other had, however, disgusted him with Parliament and determined him to change his politics. After his release, having contrived an introduction to the King at Hampton Court, he had knelt before his Majesty, kissed his Majesty's hand, asked forgiveness, and received it. One of the first consequences was a pamphlet on the King's side, called *The Case of the Kingdom stated.* Another, even more important, was the *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, started Sept. 14, 1647, and continued ever since. Here Needham had striven to undo all he had formerly done in the *Britannicus;* and, "being very "witty, satirical against the Presbyterians, and full of loyalty," the paper "made him known to and admired by the bravadoes "and wits of those times." It was, indeed, a paper of ineffable ribaldry; and there may be collected from it the choicest specimens of that buffoon rhetoric of the day against the Roundheads of all varieties, and against Cromwell and his adherents in particular, which it has pleased the Literary Fates to let pass into the language of more permanent History. Perhaps more than any other man Needham helped in the invention of those numberless nicknames for Cromwell, some of which survive. "The Brewer," "Crum-Hell," "Noll,"

---

[1] Lowndes's Bibliographer's Manual, by Bohn, Art. Εἰκὼν Βασιλική; Commons Journals, March 16, 1648—9; also Baillie's Letters, III. 87, where, in a letter from the Scottish Commissioners at the Hague to the Commission of the Kirk in Scotland, dated April 3, 1649, they say, "Ane unhappy book, "Εἰκὼν Βασιλική, does us much pre-"judice." In the Thomason collection there is, with the date April 7, 1648—9, a MS. "Copy of Verses ex-"plaining the Frontispiece to the King's "Book."

"Nod-Noll," "Copper-face," "The Town-Bull," "His Nose-"ship," and latterly, with a touch of superior genius, "The "Almighty Nose" or "Nose Almighty":—such are a few of the metonymies and metaphors one or other of which always stood for Cromwell in the pages of *Pragmaticus.* That the paper had not been put down, and Needham extinguished, is now the wonder. By various devices for secret printing and selling, however, and by absconding from London occasionally, he had both saved himself and continued his journal, so that, in the infancy of the Commonwealth, *Mercurius Pragmaticus* was perhaps the sharpest literary thorn in its side. It surpassed, in talent for invective, such contemporary Royalist journals as *The Man in the Moon* and *The Moderate*, and was far cleverer than such neutral or Government papers as *The Weekly Intelligencer*, *The Metropolitan Nuncio*, and *The Army's Modest Intelligencer*.[1]

THE GOVERNMENT CONTINUED IN THE RUMP PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL OF STATE: THEIR FIRST ACTS: RESOLUTION FOR THE RECONQUEST OF IRELAND BY CROMWELL: HOME DIFFICULTIES: LILBURNE AND THE LONDON CONSPIRACY OF LEVELLERS: ARMY-MUTINY.—RELATIONS WITH FOREIGN POWERS: ASSASSINATION OF DORISLAUS.—SUPPRESSION OF THE LEVELLERS.

Such being the surroundings and such the internal state of the infant Commonwealth, it is not to be wondered at that the men at the centre, though they had but recently framed, or adopted from Ireton, the famous draft *Agreement of the People*, proposing an immediate dissolution of the existing fragment of a Parliament and a new general election after a Plebiscite taken on fundamentals, were very slow to carry out these proposals. Henry Marten's witty parable at a later date was quite applicable now. When the child Moses was found by Pharaoh's daughter in the ark of bulrushes, and Pharaoh's daughter wanted a nurse for it, to whom but the child's own mother, said Marten, was the office entrusted! Better, then, that the baby Commonwealth should be nursed for a while by those who had brought it into being! Such by this time was probably Ireton's own opinion. At all events, dissolution by the end of April was impossible; and the fragment of a Parliament and the Council of State set themselves manfully to do whatever was necessary for the present.[1]

---

[1] Notes from my readings in the Thomason Collection and in its catalogue; Wood's Ath. Oxon, III. 1180—1190 (Memoir of Needham). In Nichols's *Literary Anecdotes,* IV. 33—97, there is a most valuable chronological list of early English newspapers, with the dates in most cases of their first numbers. From this list it appears that no fewer than 170 weekly papers of various kinds and various shades of politics had been started in England (chiefly in London) between the commencement of the Civil War in Aug. 1642 and the King's death in Jan. 1648—9. Most of these had perished after a few numbers; but some survived into the Commonwealth, and about fifteen new ones were started within the first four months of the Commonwealth.

Some of their acts, indeed, lay in the past as already done. Such was the Trial, by another special High Court of Justice, of the chief delinquents, next to the King, that had been left in their hands—the Duke of Hamilton (Earl of Cambridge in the English Peerage), the Earl of Holland, Lord Goring, Lord Capel, and Sir John Owen. The Trial had been duly concluded; and, after votes of mercy in Parliament in favour of Goring and Owen, the other three had died on the scaffold (March 9). By Hamilton's death, without male issue, his brother, the Earl of Lanark, had become the second Duke of Hamilton, and had begun to be so styled at the Hague even while we have been speaking of him there by his old name of Lanark. A few other unpardonable culprits were on the proscribed list as banished, or were reserved in prison for punishment; but on the whole the policy of the Government was not to trouble people too much for past offences.—There had been some trouble with the Law-Courts, six of the twelve Judges having declined to serve under the Commonwealth; but the difficulty had been met by new appointments and promotions, including the nomination of Whitlocke and Lisle jointly to be Commissioners of the Great Seal. The old Seal had been broken to pieces on the floor of the House by a workman brought in on purpose, and it was a new Republican seal that was in the custody of these gentlemen. The Acts formally abolishing the Kingly office and the House of Peers had been passed, and ordered to be published; and there had been published also a national Republican manifesto, mainly of Whitlocke's penning, entitled, *Declaration for the Satisfaction of the Kingdom* [sic!] *touching the late Proceedings of the Parliament*, with orders that it should be translated immediately into Latin, French, and Dutch (March 17). The Earl of Warwick's tenure of the office of Lord High Admiral had been abolished, and the duties of that great office vested in the Council of State (Feb. 20), with the result, three days afterwards, that Robert Blake, Edward Popham, and Richard Dean, were appointed Generals of the Fleet of the Republic. The care of the late King's library at St. James's, now called "The Public Library," with the statues and pictures therein, had in like manner been committed to the Council of State; and there had been votes as to the disposal of the personal estates of the late King and Queen, and some votes of taxation. Other such measures, indispensable in the new adjustment of things, the reader can imagine miscellaneously for himself. We shall take affairs now in their main current.[1]

---

[1] Henry Marten's parable was not propounded till 1653. See Clar. 792.*

On the 5th of March, 1648–9, the Council of State ascertained, and on the 6th they reported to the House, that the total of the available military forces then in England and Wales was 44,373 horse and foot, that all these were needed for the service of the Republic, and that, for the maintenance of these and the relief of what troops there were then in Ireland, £120,000 a month would be necessary. It was agreed at the same time between the Council and the House that 12,000 horse and foot from the English army should be sent over to Ireland to reinforce or replace the said exhausted troops. Farther communications as to the modelling of this Army of 12,000 for Ireland having then passed between the Council of State and the House, it was recommended by the Council of State, March 15, that Lieutenant-General Cromwell should be made Commander-in-Chief of that Army. On the 30th of the same month the House approved of the suggestion and appointed Cromwell accordingly, at the same time resolving that Fairfax should still be the supreme General of all the Forces of the Parliament, whether in England or in Ireland. Probably Cromwell himself, out of generous regard for Fairfax, had arranged this matter of etiquette.[1]

---

[1] Commons Journals of dates given and of various others; Parl. Hist. of same months; Godwin, Vol. III. early chapters; Whitlocke, March 14—16. Whitlocke's lapse into the word "King-"dom" in his document is rather characteristic.

Thus, in March 1648–9, the Government of the Commonwealth had declared itself on one great point. They had resolved that the first scene of action should be Ireland. The Scots might go on under the Argyle rule, pleasing themselves with the fiction that Charles II. was their King, and negotiating with him at the Hague till he should agree to their terms; but meanwhile, so far as appeared, the prime danger was not in that quarter. The prime danger was in Ireland, now lost to English control, and given up to Ormond and chaos, save for the small footing in the east and north retained by Colonel Michael Jones, Colonel George Monk, and Sir Charles Coote. Charles II. or no Charles II., Ireland must be recovered and re-attached to England!—Which main resolution having been taken, the procedure of the Government of the Commonwealth, so far as it did not consist in the necessary preparations for Cromwell's expedition into Ireland and in orders for the fleets with which Blake, Popham, and Dean were to keep all the seas clear, resolved itself into (1) Dealings with Home Difficulties, and (2) Diplomacy with Foreign Powers.

What the Home Difficulties were we have already seen. One of the most annoying was the license of the Royalist press in London. To this matter the Council of State had begun at once to attend. As early as Feb. 23 an order was issued by the Council for the apprehension of one Thomson, the printer of a protest of the imprisoned and secluded members of Parliament; and next day his examination was referred to a Committee. On the 26th it was agreed that there should be Council-warrants in future for the apprehension of any such persons as should either speak or act anything against the safety of the Commonwealth; and on the 20th of March, eight days after Bradshaw had taken his seat as Lord President, the power of signing such warrants was entrusted to him.[1] Needham or *Pragmaticus* might now be reached. The Council began, however, with a yet more formidable antagonist, or nest of antagonists.

---

[1] Order Books of Council of State and Commons Journals for the days named.

The world was never to hear the last of John Lilburne. We left him sixteen months ago (Vol. III. p. 583) a disappointed spectator at the Rendezvous at Ware, when Fairfax and Cromwell crushed the Mutiny of the Levellers or ultra-democrats in the Army, quashed the Army-agitatorships, and pledged the Army to that course of obedience to their chiefs which had led to triumph and the Republic at last. Through all the interval Lilburne, with the recollection of that scene in his mind, and especially of the poor mutineer, named Arnald, whom it had been then necessary to shoot, had been nursing his wrath, watching events, and writing more pamphlets. He had written about fifty pamphlets in all between 1640 and the end of 1648. But the formation of the Republic was a glorious new opportunity. To Lilburne's mind it was not a Republic of the right sort, but a crafty imposition upon England; and, in the name of English liberty, he and his associates would speak out. They first did so on the 26th of Feb., when Lilburne and others appeared as petitioners to the House and delivered in a paper called *The Serious Apprehensions of a part of the People on behalf of the Commonwealth.* This was not enough. On the 1st of March there appeared a pamphlet called *England's New Chains Discovered*, consisting of a criticism of that draft "Agreement of the People" by Ireton which was assumed to represent the theoretical views of the existing powers; and on the 24th of March this was followed by two more pamphlets from the same quarter. One of these bore the quaint title of *The Hunting of the Foxes from Newmarket and Triploe Heath to Whitehall by Five Small Beagles*, and professed to be a tracking of Cromwell, Ireton, and the other Army grandees, in their nefarious practices, from the time when the Army was quartered at the places named, and the Agitatorships were in full action (June 1647), to their present usurped pre-eminence. The other was a *Second Part of England's New Chains Discovered,* much more violent than the "First Part." It declared the Parliament to be "under the dominion of a Council of State and a con-"stitution of a new and unexperienced nature"; it protested against the proposal in that constitution that each Parliament should sit six months only while the Council of State should hold office for eighteen; it objected in any case to the actual composition of the Council of State, e. g. to the five ex-Peers in it; it denied the right of the Representative House itself to erect or abolish Courts of Justice; it demanded more provision for liberty of conscience, and more liberty for the press; it begged Parliament to "dissolve this present Council "of State, and manage affairs by committees of short con-"tinuance;" and it begged the House also, in its arrangements for the Parliament that was to succeed itself, to see that there should not be a day of interval between the two, and to revive the Self-Denying Ordinance so as to bring in plenty of new men. Here was a revelation of a danger for the Commonwealth differing from all we have heretofore enumerated, and not yet taken sufficiently into account. It was a proclamation of a war within the Republic itself, of a war of the ultra-Republicans, or Republicans of the Levelling creed, against the framers and guardians of the existing Republic. As it was not known how wide the canker might extend, and especially whether it was not already festering in the Army, as a relic or reappearance of the ultra-democracy of the old Agitatorships, there was no small alarm. On the 27th of March the *Second Part of England's New Chains* was discussed and condemned in the House, and it was referred to the Council of State to find out the authors, contrivers, and printers, and proceed against them for high treason, and to Fairfax to make due inquiries as to complicity in the Army. It was already known that the immediate authors and contrivers were four of the "five small beagles" aforesaid:—viz. JOHN LILBURNE, still styled "Lieutenant-Colonel;" RICHARD OVER-

---

[1] Order Books of Council.

TON, his former coadjutor in the ultra-democratic propagandism in the Army (Vol. III. 528–529); WILLIAM WALWYN, a merchant in some small way, mentioned long ago as a sectary of a peculiar type (Vol. III. 153); and THOMAS PRINCE. The combination of levelling principles in politics with extreme religious heterodoxy in at least two of the four is worth noting. Overton, it is believed, had been the chief author of the famous materialistic tract of 1643, called *Man's Mortality* (Vol. III. 156–157), though Clement Wrighter may have helped; and Walwyn was accused of the doctrine of the lawfulness of suicide, the doctrine of polygamy, Anti-Scripturism, and general Jesuitry. Indeed, there is proof that the more pious Anabaptists of London, such as Richardson, Kiffin, and Spilsbury, held purposely aloof from all four, and from their conspiracy.[1]

Wednesday the 28th of March was a tremendous day in the Council of State at Derby House. Very early in the morning Lilburne had been arrested in his lodging at Winchester House, Southwark, and marched by a body of soldiers through the streets to St. Paul's, where he found Walwyn and Prince also under arrest. After having seen the warrant, and had their "morning's draughts" at a public-house with the officers in charge, the three had been taken by water to Whitehall and so to Derby House. Thither meanwhile Overton also had been conveyed, having been captured asleep by Colonel Axtell, in what seems to have been a very squalid domicile, and in disreputable company. The Council having now met, they were called in one by one, Lilburne first. "I "marched into the room," he says, "with my hat on; but, "looking about me, I saw divers of the House of Commons "present, and so I put it off." Bradshaw having informed him of the charge, and having given him leave to say anything he liked, "Well, then, Mr. Bradshaw," John had begun, "with your favour, thus: I am an Englishman born, "bred, and brought up; and England is a nation governed, "bounded, and limited by laws and liberties." So on at some length, refusing to acknowledge the Council of State as of any authority in England, till, on the conclusion of his speech, Bradshaw said, "Lieutenant-Colonel Lilburne, you need not "be so earnest and have spent so much time: this Council doth "not go about to try you." Again Lilburne said something; after which he withdrew, and Walwyn was called in. While the Council were interrogating Walwyn, Lilburne chatted with Overton and Prince in the adjoining room; and then Overton had his turn with the Council, and then Prince. A second time Lilburne was called in by himself, and asked if he would acknowledge having had a hand in the obnoxious tract. This question he refused to answer, breaking out again about Law and Liberty, and protesting especially against being in martial custody, instead of civil. "If, for "all this," he said, "you shall send me back to the military "sword again, either to Whitehall or any other such-like "garrisoned place in England, I do solemnly protest, before "the Eternal God of Heaven and Earth, I will fire it, and "burn it down to the ground, if possibly I can, although I "be burnt to ashes with the flames thereof." With a significant look at Cromwell, he says, he added something about his past experience of the honour and justice of Army grandees. The other three, also severally called in a second time, still declined the Council's authority. "After we were all come "out," says Lilburne, "and all four in a room close by them, "all alone, I laid my ear to their door and heard Lieutenant-"General Cromwell (I am sure of it) very loud, thumping his "fist upon the Council table till it rang again, and heard

---

[1] Commons Journals of dates given and of April 2; Catalogue of Thomason's Collection in the British Museum; copy of the *Second Part of England's New Chains* there; Carlyle's Cromwell (edit. 1857), II. 17—18; Tract of June 2, 1649, in the Thomason Collection, called *The Discoverer*. There is, in the same collection, a curious tract of Walwyn's own, called *The Fountain of Slaunder Discovered* (May 30, 1649), in which, in a maundering, half-educated style, of very small ability, he gives a sketch of his life. He had come from Worcestershire; had been fifteen years in the parish of St. James, Garlick Hill, near Moorfields, and still lived there; had been married twenty-one years and "had almost "twenty children;" had never, in his merchandizing, been beyond the seas, but had had a brother who died in Flanders, and whose funeral in a proper Protestant way had cost him near 50*l*. That would show he was no Jesuit; and that all the stories of his extreme hostility to religion were untrue—e. g. that he "desired to have all the Bibles "in England burnt,"—would be seen by any one who looked into the pamphlets (five of them named) which he had written in reply to Mr. Thomas Edwards of the *Gangræna*. Only he confessed he was "an enemy to superstition" and a radical Reformer, who might expect the same treatment that men of his stamp had always received in this world.

"him speak in these very words, or to this effect: 'I tell "'you, Sir, you have no other way to deal with these men "'but to break them to pieces.'" More follows of what he overheard Cromwell say, with the information that he thinks it was Ludlow's voice that pressed for admitting them to bail, and this addition: "Upon which discourse of Cromwell's the "blood ran up and down in my veins, and I heartily wished "myself in again amongst them (being scarce able to contain "myself), that so I might have gone five or six storeys higher "than I did before." It was not till twelve at night that the Council broke up, after committing the four prisoners to the Tower.[1]

On the same day the House ordered an Act to be prepared against ministers of London, or in England and Wales generally, who should vent sedition in their pulpits. This had been suggested by the case of a Mr. Thomas Cawton, a Presbyterian parish minister in the city, who had prayed for Charles II. publicly, and spoken for him in his sermon. It took some time to pass the Act; but meanwhile both the House and the Council were vigilant. The Lord Mayor of London, Abraham Reynoldson, was ejected from his office, fined £2000, and sent to the Tower for a month (April 2), for having refused to proclaim the Act abolishing the Kingly office, and one or two Aldermen were discharged with him, or soon afterwards. There were orders against the circulation of Lilburne's *New Chains,* and of other and newer pamphlets which he and his fellow-prisoners contrived to send forth from the Tower. Also, in spite of three great petitions in favour of Lilburne, sent in, or forthcoming, from his London admirers, one of them signed entirely by women, the House resolved (April 11) to keep him and his companions in the Tower for future trial.[2]

Lilburne's tenets, or wilder tenets still, it appeared, did pervade considerable masses, both of the people and of the Army. Beyond the Levellers, who would raze down all to one flat surface, there was a sect, calling themselves "The Diggers," who wanted to go down to the foundations. They consisted, however, only of a poor company of half-crazed men, who had gone out with a retired Army-man as their Prophet, to live on the Surrey hills, planting roots and beans, inviting all the world to join them, and preaching the community of goods and the iniquity of park-palings. These "Communists" were easily dispersed; but there was harder work with the "Levellers" proper. A spirit of mutiny which had been latent for some time among the common soldiers of the regiments quartered in London, or which was apparent at first only in the form of petitions in Lilburne's phraseology, and demands for a renewal of the system of Agitatorships among the rank and file, broke out at length in distinct riot at the Bull Inn in Bishopsgate Street. Fairfax and Cromwell had to hurry to the spot. Their presence was conclusive. Fifteen of the mutineers were tried by Court-Martial; six were condemned to death; five of these were pardoned; but one of them, Robert Lockyer, a young trooper, very popular with his comrades, was shot in St. Paul's Churchyard (April 26). There was much lamentation for him, with a great demonstration in the streets at his funeral; but the Levellers in the London regiments had been taught their lesson.[1]

---

[1] Order Book of Council of State, March 28, 1649; and Tract called *The Picture of the Council of State held forth to the free People of England,* being in fact an account by Lilburne himself, with additions by Overton and the others, of the proceedings of the famous day. It was published from the Tower, April 11, i.e. within a fortnight after the facts, and is altogether a curiosity.

[2] Commons Journals of days named and of March 6, and Council Order Books.

One of the very first acts of the Council of State had been to appoint a committee of eight of their number to consider, with the benefit of Selden's advice, the whole subject of the diplomatic relations of the Commonwealth to "other Na-"tions, Kingdoms, and Republics." The subject had recurred once or twice, more especially in connexion with the unsatisfactory state of diplomatic intercourse, since the King's death, between England and the Dutch. There was still a Dutch ambassador in London, left there after the departure of the special embassy that had pleaded for the King's life; and Mr. Walter

---

[1] Whitlocke, March 1 and 3, and April 17, 20, and 26; Carlyle's Cromwell, II. 22—26; Godwin, III. 64 et seq.

Strickland, who was English Resident at the Hague, was believed to be a very good man for that post. It was thought desirable, however, that some more express envoy to the United Provinces should be conjoined with Strickland. Accordingly, on the 18th of April, the Council of State resolved to recommend Dr. Isaac Dorislaus as a fit person for the mission. A Dutchman by birth and education, he had been long a naturalized Englishman; he had married an English wife, and had held, at various times, important offices and trusts in England. He had been History Professor at Cambridge, Professor in Gresham College, Advocate General of Essex's Parliamentarian Army, and, last of all, one of the counsel for the prosecution in the late King's trial. He was the very man to represent English interests at the Hague! So it was thought; and Dorislaus, having received his credentials, took ship for Holland immediately. It was a fatal mission. He had just arrived at the Hague, and was sitting at supper at the public table in an inn called "The Swan," when some men in masks entered, begged the company not to disturb themselves, and stabbed him dead (May 3). It was believed that the assassins were some Scottish refugee-officers, of Montrose's following.[1]

The news of the assassination of Dorislaus reached London on the 9th of May; and for some days there was a profound sensation on the subject, with discussions in the Council and in Parliament, and votes of a pension of £200 a year for his son, £500 at once for each of his daughters, and a public funeral when his body should be brought home. There would be some difficulty, it was now seen, in finding men willing to go abroad on such perilous diplomatic service. There was more pressing business on foot, however, than the choice of a successor to Dorislaus; and Fairfax and Cromwell had been away from their places in the Council since the 7th of May, attending to that business in their military capacity.—The Levellers in the London regiments had been brought to order by mere Court-martial; but there were actual insurrections of Levellers in the Midlands and elsewhere, requiring stronger measures. A Captain William Thompson, from his rendezvous at Banbury in Oxfordshire, where he was at the head of two hundred horse, had sent forth (May 6) a manifesto, called *England's Standard Advanced, or a Declaration from Mr. William Thompson and the oppressed people of this nation under his conduct:* which manifesto was, in fact, a proclamation of adhesion to Lilburne and his fellow-prisoners, with a demand for their release, for revival of the old system of Army-agitatorships, and for vengeance for the blood of Lockyer, and of his predecessor in martyrdom, Arnald. In Gloucestershire and at Salisbury there were similar outbreaks among disaffected regiments; there were communications between the centres of disaffection; a little delay, and there would be a junction of forces and a marching rebellion of thousands. Fortunately, Thompson's own Colonel, coming suddenly upon him and his band at Banbury, overpowered them at once (May 10), only Thompson himself and a few others escaping. It remained for Fairfax and Cromwell to deal with the other masses. As usual, they accomplished the task to perfection. The Salisbury mutineers, a thousand strong, had marched north through part of Hants and through Berks, gathering other insurgent bodies in their route, but opposed at a bridge over the Isis by the same Colonel that had routed Thompson, so that they had to wade or swim the river higher up in order to reach Burford in Oxfordshire. There it all ended. Fairfax and Cromwell, who had been on the way to Salisbury, had doubled north in pursuit; a single day's extraordinary march brought them to Burford; and at midnight, on the 14th of May, Cromwell entered the town with 2000 men. There were some shots, but no battle: all had to surrender. The necessary Council of War followed, with the usual clemency of Fairfax and Cromwell in executing its decisions. Cornet Thompson, brother of the Captain, and two Corporals, were shot; a Cornet Dean, sentenced also to be shot, was reprieved as penitent at the last moment; the rest, who had been looking on, and regarded themselves as liable to decimation, were but well lectured and dismissed, as men who must be under disgrace for a time, but might yet be useful to the Commonwealth. The fugitive Captain Thompson having been overtaken in a wood and killed fighting some days afterwards, the insurrection of the Levellers was over, and the Commonwealth was safe.[1]

---

[1] Council Order Books of dates; Clarendon, 711 and 742; Wood's Ath. III. 666—7; Whitlocke, May 9. Whitlocke speaks of the assassins as English cavaliers in disguise, and some such were suspected; but Clarendon was at the Hague, and was likely to know.

TRIUMPHANT CONFIRMATION OF THE REPUBLIC: THE *FAIRFAXIAN CREATION* AT OXFORD, AND THE LONDON CITY BANQUET: REMOVAL OF THE COUNCIL OF STATE TO WHITEHALL: REMOVAL OF CHARLES II. FROM THE HAGUE: DEPARTURE OF CROMWELL FOR THE LORD-LIEUTENANCY OF IRELAND: STATE OF ENGLAND AS HE LEFT IT.

On the 19th of May, 1649, just after the suppression of the Levellers, Oxford was the scene of a remarkable ceremonial and festival. The presence of Fairfax and Cromwell in the vicinity, or rather their arrival in the city on the 17th, had suggested to the University authorities that there should be a grand demonstration of fraternity between the University and the Army. For Oxford, it is to be remembered, was no longer the old Oxford. The resistance to the Parliamentary Visitation and imposition of the Covenant, which had been begun in 1647 by the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Fell (Vol. III. pp. 545, 546), and which had been protracted with the most desperate obstinacy by him, his wife, the Pro-Vicechancellors that came in his room after he was taken to London in custody, and by the Heads of Houses, Fellows, and Scholars generally, had ended as it could not but end. In the course of 1648 the University had been cleared of all the most oppugnant Heads, Fellows, and Officials, to the number of two or three hundreds, and brought into a condition similar to that in which Cambridge had been since 1644. The Earl of Pembroke was Chancellor; the Vice-Chancellor was Dr. Edward Reynolds, from the Westminster Assembly of Divines, who had been made Dean of Christ Church instead of Dr. Fell; seven of the old Heads of Houses and three of the old University Professors had conformed and retained office; twelve of the old Heads and six of the old Professors had been ejected, and had been succeeded by new men—about half of these being Divines of note from the Westminster Assembly; the very Proctors were to correspond. On the whole, with this infusion from the Westminster Assembly, and with the pledge which all or most of the Heads had given to the Covenant, Oxford, like the sister University, now wore the Presbyterian colours. This was not to prevent, however, the special demonstration of good will to the new Republic and its rulers which circumstances had made appropriate. Accordingly, arrangements having been hurriedly made, and the Colleges vying with each other in hospitalities to the illustrious visitors, there was a great University meeting, at which Fairfax and Cromwell were created Doctors of Law, while the honorary M.A. degree was conferred on Colonels Sir Hardress Waller, Harrison, Ingoldsby, Hewson, Okey, and six other officers, with a reserve of the same for Colonel Cobbet, Joyce of Holmby House celebrity, and some others not present, but whose names were written down for the purpose by Cromwell and Fairfax. The affair was remembered in the University as *The Fairfaxian Creation.*[1]

---

[1] Notes from Council Order Books of May; Whitlocke, various dates in same month; Clement Walker's History of Independency, Part II. 167—171, where Captain Thompson's manifesto is given; Godwin, III. 70—78; Carlyle's Cromwell, II. 26—28. The gravity of the crisis is attested by not a few contemporary printed tracts besides Thompson's manifesto (which reached London, May 12): e.g. *The Unanimous* [Levelling] *Declaration of Colonel Scroope's and Commissary General Ireton's Regiments at a Rendezvous at Old Sarum, the* 11*th of May,* 1649, and *A Declaration from his Excellency* [Fairfax] *with the advice of his Council of War, concerning the present distempers of part of Commissary General Ireton's and of Colonel Scroope's Regiments,* dated "Aulton, Hampshire, May 12, 1649." In *Mercurius Britannicus* for May 8—15 (No. 3 of that newspaper), there is this piece of news, under date "Wednesday, May 9"—"This day the Lo. "General [Fairfax] and Lieutenant "General [Cromwell] rendezvoused a "party of horse in Hyde Park, and from "thence began their march, to suppress "the parties of horse called *Levellers.*" Five days, therefore, sufficed for the whole military part of the business.

The Oxford ceremonial and festival was but the first sign of a mood of congratulation which became general. As far as the chief home difficulty was concerned, the masters of the Republic might now consider themselves secure. Lilburne and his associates were still in the Tower; a new Act of Treason had been brought in (May 1), more applicable to the case of such culprits than any former law; and the House, making up its mind at last to say something on the delicate question of its own dissolution, had come (May 15) to the significant decision that "in order to the declaring a certain "time for putting a period to the sitting of this Parliament, "this House is of opinion, That in the first place consideration "be had of the stating the succession of future Parliaments, "and of the regulating of their elections." That might be done at leisure; and meanwhile the existing Parliament and the existing Council of State were to go on governing the Republic. That there might be no farther doubts that it was actually a Republic they were to govern, an Act "declaring "and constituting the People of England to be a Common-"wealth and Free State" was passed and ordered to be printed, May 19, the very day of the Fairfaxian Creation at Oxford, and fresh proclamation of the abolition of the Kingly office was made in the City of London, May 30, by Andrews, the new Republican Lord Mayor, and fourteen consenting Aldermen. By this time Fairfax, Cromwell, and the other absent officers had returned to town and received the thanks of the House (May 26) for their great service in the suppression of the Levellers. But the paragon of days in London was Thursday, June 7, when, by order of the House, there was a solemn Thanksgiving to God for the same mercy, with extraordinary sermons by Mr. Thomas Goodwin and Mr. John Owen, in Christ Church, Newgate Street, followed by a City banquet in Grocers' Hall, given by the Lord Mayor and Corporation to the House, the Council of State, the Judges, and the Officers of the Army. How important this affair was considered, and what a sense of dignity, and of the necessity of supporting it by outward symbol and etiquette, was now growing in the minds of the representatives of the Commonwealth, may be judged from the following order of the Council of State two days before the event:—"That it be reported to the House as the opinion of "this Council that, after the sermons are ended, the Lord

---

[1] Wood's Fasti Oxon, II. 118—156; Neal's Puritans (edit. 1795), III. 398—435.

"Mayor, Aldermen, and members of the Common Council, "do stay at the entrance of the gate going to Grocers' Hall, "there to receive the Speaker and Members of Parliament. "The Sword is there to be delivered by the Lord Mayor to "the Speaker, who is presently to redeliver the same; and "the Lord Mayor is to carry the same before the Speaker "and Members of Parliament until he comes into the house "of Grocers' Hall. The Speaker, Members of Parliament, "and Council of State, to dine by themselves; the Lord "Mayor and Aldermen in like manner by themselves; the "Judges by themselves; and the Officers of the Army in "like manner by themselves: the Speaker [Lenthall] at "the upper end, the General [Fairfax] next on the right "hand, and the Lord President [Bradshaw] over against "him, the Lords Commissioners of the Great Seal [Whitlocke "and Lisle] next to them, and the Lords [Pembroke and the "other ex-Peers] next, then the Lieutenant-General [Cromwell]." The dinner was very sumptuous, Whitlocke tells us, but there were no toasts.[1]

It was at this time that the Council of State removed from their temporary quarters at Derby House to the more splendid accommodations of Whitehall Palace. The Royalist news-writers and pamphleteers, who had for some weeks been in high spirits over the outbreak of Lilburne and the Levellers, but were now deprived of that hope, then found a new topic. Thus Marchamont Needham in *Mercurius Pragmaticus* for May 29—June 5:—"The stately Palace of "Whitehall, being thus made a den of thieves, and inhabited "by none but scoundrel mechanics, is thought the fittest "place for the state vagabonds to dwell in. O who would "have thought these Self-Denying Devils should have "assumed to the honour of such a majestic seat: viz. the "Chamber Entering the Presence, the Presence Chamber and "the other adjoining, and the Withdrawing-room—all richly "hanged (if *they* were all hanged it were better!) with most "sumptuous and costly hangings—where Noll Maggotface,

---

[1] Commons Journals of days named; Order Book of Council of State, June 5; Whitlocke, June 7.

"with as much gravity as the Grand Seignior when he enters "his Seraglio, possesses himself of the Chair." Another topic with the pamphleteers was the handsomeness of the official salaries which the New Masters of the State were voting for themselves—e. g. £2000 a year to President Bradshaw, with a gift of £1000 more—and the alacrity with which they accepted grants and additional offices of emolument, or bestowed such on their kinsmen and political friends. To investigate with real accuracy all the Royalist traditions on this topic would be toilsome and tedious. What I *have* observed is that the Republic was certainly liberal in its rate of pay, and very prompt and generous in rewarding any who distinguished themselves highly, or suffered much, in its service. The vote of £200 a year for life to the son of Dorislaus (equal to £700 a year or more now), and £500 at once to each of his daughters (equal to £1750 now), is but one instance out of many.[1]

The assassination of Dorislaus had had one good effect. There had, of course, been remonstrances on that outrage, addressed to the States General of the United Provinces; the States General and the Stadtholder himself were ashamed of the outrage, and disowned it; and it was signified to Charles II. that the Hague could no longer shelter him and his menagerie of refugees. After consultations and courteous leave-takings, therefore, Charles had begun a tour, by Antwerp and Brussels towards Paris, for a meeting with his mother at St. Germains, the refugees following him, or dispersing themselves hither and thither. Meanwhile, the Scottish Commissioners from the Argyle Government having utterly failed in their efforts to induce Charles to accept the Covenant and the other strict Presbyterian terms, the understanding among the refugees was that the initiative in Scotland had been abandoned, and that, unless Queen Henrietta Maria should alter her son's purpose, his destination was Ireland. The prospects there were increasingly favourable. Prince Rupert's fleet, indeed, was blockaded in Kinsale harbour by Admirals Blake and Dean; but Ormond had taken the field afresh (June 1) with an army of 8000, was driving Monk before him, and was threatening Jones in Dublin. The arrival of Charles himself in Ireland as soon as possible was highly desirable.[1]

---

[1] *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, as cited; Clement Walker's History of Independency, Part II. p. 184 (where Walker borrows expressions from *Pragmaticus*, if indeed he had not supplied Needham with the article); *The Mystery of the Good Old Cause*, reprinted from the original tract of 1660 in Parl. Hist. III. 1591—1612. As another illustration, fit only for a foot-note, of the ribaldry of the Royalist pamphleteers at this date against the Commonwealth and all connected with it, I may cite a squib with this title, "*A Tragi-Comedy, called Newmarket Fair: or a Parliament Outcry of State Commodities set for sale, . . . printed at you may go look:* 1649." The date, by Thomason, is June 15. The squib is a kind of satirical drama, the scene of which is Westminster, and the characters Fairfax, Cromwell, Lady Fairfax, Mrs. Cromwell, Ireton, Skippon, Marten, Rainsborough's widow, criers, messengers, &c. The Crown of England is set up for sale; Fairfax and Cromwell bid against each other for it; and their wives take part. Lady Fairfax says to Mrs. Cromwell: "What! would ye, "Mistress Yeast and Grains? Would ye, "Brazen-face?" Mrs. Cromwell retorts: "Call me Mistress Brazen-face, thou "Rotterdam slut, thou; call me Brazen-"face! Thou lookest more like a Fool's-"face than I do a Brazen-face, or a "Copper-face either. Come, come: *I* "never had a bastard by another man "when my husband was at the Leaguer "before Breda; nor I keep not company "with Cavaliers at taverns in my hus-"band's absence. Gorge me that, gorge "me that."

It was desirable, on the other hand, that Cromwell should be in Ireland, and there was now nothing to hinder. The regiments that were to complete his army of 12,000 men had been selected by lot (April 20)—Ireton's, Lambert's, Horton's, Scroope's, for horse, and Ewer's, Hewson's, Cook's, and Dean's, for foot, besides dragoons. It had been arranged (June 13) that Ireton should be second in command; and it was finally settled that Cromwell's own title should be "Lord "Lieutenant General and General Governor of Ireland," that the military and civil commands should be conjoined in his person, with £8000 a year for the first and about £5000 a year for the second, and that his term of office should be three years. All other preparations having been made, and the transports lying ready at Bristol, Cromwell took his departure from London, July 10, with all magnificence. His coach was drawn by six Flanders mares; other coaches accompanied; his lifeguard consisted of eighty commissioned officers; and the trumpets sounded and the people gazed as he drove away. *A Hue and Cry after Cromwell* is the title of a Royalist squib published in London after he was gone.[2]

---

[1] Clarendon, 711—722; Commons Journals, May 18 and June 25; Godwin, III. 142—143.

[2] Whitlocke, under dates; with Com-

Well might there be a hue and cry after Cromwell. It is told of Dante that once, when it was proposed to send him on a very difficult mission, and his colleagues were urgent that he should go because he was the fittest man among them, he replied, "Yes: but what if I should be also the fittest man to "stay here?" So of Cromwell's going to Ireland. How was England to be managed in his absence?

There was, in the first place, THE COUNCIL OF STATE, without Cromwell. It consisted, as we have seen, of about forty men, of whom nine were a quorum, and of whom from ten to eighteen of the ablest and most industrious were usually present, though occasionally there was not even a quorum and the meeting had to be adjourned. Then there was THE PARLIAMENT, with most of the Council in it, and so few besides that it was little else than an *alter ego* of the Council. The largest attendance of the House recorded in its Journals from the King's death to Cromwell's departure for Ireland is seventy-seven, and the smallest twenty-eight; the average attendance was from forty-five to fifty-five. Resolutions had been passed enabling members ejected by Pride's Purge, or who had discontinued attendance about that time, to reclaim

mons Journals, Council Order Book for June 13, Mrs. Green's Calendar, Preface, p. xlv., and Carlyle's Cromwell, II. 30. Besides the *Hue and Cry after Cromwell*, the Catalogue of the Thomason Collection notes, as published July 16, a squib, by Richard Overton, called *The Baiting of the Great Bull of Bashan unfolded*. A later tract which I have read, of date Aug. 7, entitled *A New Bull-Baiting, or a Match played at the Town-Bull of Ely by Twelve Mongrels*, was, I suppose, a Royalist travesty of this last. It represents, in a rigmarole dialogue of disgusting scurrility, Lilburne, Overton, Walwyn, Prince, and others, as bull-baiting Cromwell. Overton is made to say, in one speech, "It "had been good he had gone to the "butcher's so soon as he had been "calved . . . He junkets, feasts, and "kings it in his chariot with six "Flanders mares, and ruffles in suits "of £500 a-piece . . . Cain was the first "gentleman of his family; Judas was "the second that bore arms (three elder-"trees and a halter); Coram, Dathan, "and Abiram, his uncles by the mother's "side; Achan his godfather; Absalom "his schoolmaster; the two wicked "elders his tutors; Machiavel his "counsellor; Faux and Fairfaux his "companions in evil." Prince is made to ask Overton, after this and more, whether he did not once himself adhere to Cromwell. "I profess I did," is the answer; "but he has, by swerving from "his first principles, deceived me and "thousands more." The squib ends with a mock will of Cromwell, beginning, "In the name of Pluto, Amen: I, "Noll Cromwell, alias the Town-Bull of "Ely, Lord Chief Governor of Ireland, "Grand Plotter and Contriver of all "Mischiefs in England, Lord of Misrule, "Knight of the Order of Regicides, "Thief-tenant General of the Rebels at "Westminster, Duke of Devilishness, "Ensign of Evil, Scoutmaster General to "his Infernal Majesty, being wickedly "disposed of mind, of abhorred memory, "do make this my last will and testa-"ment in manner and form following," &c. &c.

their seats on due explanation and conformity; but few had yet done so, and, though the House had threatened to issue new writs, none had yet been issued except for the seats of members deceased. In this way the Earl of Pembroke had come in for Berkshire (April 16), the Earl of Salisbury for Lynn (writ issued June 22), and Lord Howard of Escrick for Carlisle (May 5). They were the only peers who so condescended, and were treated with some ceremony in consequence. It is to be remembered that the aristocratic titles, "Duke," "Marquis," "Earl," "Lord," &c., with the social distinctions they inferred, were not abolished under the Commonwealth, but only the political independency, or superiority, of the Peerage.[1]

CESSATION OF THE WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY: ITS BEQUESTS TO ENGLAND AND TO SCOTLAND: THE SCOTTISH KIRK IN 1649.

What, all this while, of The Westminster Assembly? Alas! that famous body, so potent in England, side by side with the Parliament, from July 1643 to the end of 1648, was no longer practically in existence. Their last mass of real work had been the *Confession of Faith* and the *Larger and Shorter Catechisms*; and it is well to recollect here at least the dates of those documents. The *Confession of Faith*, finished by the Assembly after the labour of a year and a-half, had been first presented to Parliament in Dec. 1646, but had been remitted to the Assembly for the insertion of the Scriptural proofs of the various Articles (Vol. III. p. 512). Completed with this addition, it had been again presented to Parliament in April 1647, when five hundred copies and no more were ordered to be printed for the use of members; and, with these copies in their hands, the Commons had begun the work of examining and passing the Articles one by one (Vol. III. pp. 545, 567). So slowly, however, had they proceeded, and with so many interruptions, that not till March 1648 was the business concluded by that House, and not till June 1648 was there an order from Parliament for the open publication of the book, as authorized, with this title: *Articles of Religion, approved and passed by both Houses of Parliament, after advice had with an Assembly of Divines called together by them for that purpose.* More is notable here than the mere change of the name from "Confession of Faith" to "Articles of "Religion." Only the Doctrinal or purely Theological Articles of the Assembly's document were included: such entire chapters, or portions of chapters, as concerned Discipline and Church-Government were omitted as unsatisfactory or as reserved by Parliament for farther consideration—e. g. Chap. XXX. (*Of Church Censures*), Chap. XXXI. (*Of Synods and Councils*), part of Chap. XXIV. (*Of Marriage and Divorce*), and the last paragraph of Chap. XX. (*Of Christian Liberty and Liberty of Conscience*), asserting the right of the Civil Magistrate, as well as of the Church, to punish certain kinds of religious error. These parts of the Assembly's Confession, containing a good deal of what the Presbyterians regarded as the very essence of their system, never had the sanction of an English Parliament. With the Catechisms there had been also some difficulty, but not so much. The *Shorter Catechism* had been ready since Nov. 1647; the *Larger Catechism*, though presented to the two Houses in Oct. 1647 (Vol. III. p. 568), had been referred back to the Assembly for the insertion of Scriptural proofs, and had not been completed by that body in proper form till April 1648, nor passed by Parliament as authorized, and ordered to be printed, till Sept. 1648.—In these documents, added to the *Directory of Worship*, which had been passed and authorized as long ago as Jan. 1644–5 (Vol. III. p. 173), all the real energy of the Assembly had been exhausted; and, through the latter part of 1648, the number of Divines in attendance, already thinned by the dropping away of country members, and by the appointment of some of the most eminent members to University-posts, had dwindled to nearly zero. The horror of the King's trial, it is true, had roused the Presbyterian Divines to a protest on his behalf and against the usurpation of power by the Army; but that protest had been made hardly so much by the Assembly in its corporate capacity as by manifestos from the London ministers as such, and from those ministers in the provinces who were in time to join them. By these manifestos, however, Presbyterianism had taken up a position antagonistic beforehand to the principles of the Commonwealth, as well as to the acts that had brought it about. An Assembly of Divines composed almost entirely of Presbyterians could not comfortably, or even possibly, prolong itself into the Commonwealth. Accordingly, on Thursday, Feb. 22, 1648–9, three weeks after the King's death, the Assembly had held its last (i. e. its 1163rd) sitting. There was no formal abolition of it: on the contrary, it was still assumed by Parliament as existing; nay, a certain phantom of it survived as a Committee for the performance of special duties which could not be alienated or transferred. Practically, however, from that date it was defunct.[1]

---

[1] Notes from Council Order Books; Records of Divisions in Commons Journals through the period; and same Journals for dates given.

The Presbyterian form of Church-Establishment, nevertheless, so far as it had been set up in England, had by no means perished with the Westminster Assembly. Though Presbyterianism was in deadly quarrel with the Commonwealth, the Commonwealth did not profess any hostility to Presbyterianism within the legalised bounds. London, for example, which had been in the epoch of its fourth Half-yearly Provincial Synod, with Mr. Edmund Calamy for Moderator, at the time of the King's execution, had passed quietly enough (May 1649) into the epoch of its fifth Synod, with Mr. Arthur Jackson for Moderator; and one has to suppose, under these Synods, the due meetings of the twelve London Presbyteries, and of the parochial Courts of the Congregations. So in Presbyterian Lancashire; and so in other places, to whatever extent the Presbyterian apparatus had been anywhere introduced. For the true Presbyterian soul, indeed, all this was sadly insufficient. Not to speak of the radical, irreconcileable, antipathy between Presbyterianism and the Commonwealth which thus professed to shelter it, what a truncated Presbyterianism it was, after all, that the Commonwealth did shelter!

---

[1] Neal's Puritans, III. 350—354, and 452—453.

No adequate powers yet given to the Church-courts; the hideous principle of Toleration still avowed and patronized by the ruling statesmen; even the Assembly's *Confession of Faith* authorized only with the omission of some of its essentials! Any faint hope that these defects might have been remedied by Parliament had vanished utterly at the establishment of the Commonwealth. Nay, of real countenance to English Presbyterianism, such as it was, or willingness to extend it, such as it was, what hope was there from the new powers? Themselves for the most part Independents and Sectaries, what sort of religionists were they favouring, or likely to favour? Had not the Arch-Independent of the Assembly, Mr. Thomas Goodwin, and the younger Independent, Mr. John Owen, been the preachers most about the Council of State; had they not been selected as chief preachers on the great Thanksgiving Day in London; had not Parliament signified its desire that places should be found for them in the Universities; and had not Mr. Owen meanwhile been expressly chosen by Cromwell to go with him, as his friend and chaplain, into Ireland? Were not Hugh Peters, John Goodwin, Peter Sterry, and others, more or less exceptionable, of the same sort, hanging about the Council with expectations? By the promotion of such men, their gradual appointments to livings, or even by the liberty afforded them of preaching, locomotion, and combination, would not the Presbyterian Establishment be soon turned into a mockery? The Assembly's *Directory of Worship*, *Catechisms*, and *Confession of Faith*, were priceless guarantees of the Reformed Religion in England; but how were they to be enforced?[1]

There was one signal compensation. Unhappy England; but O thrice and four times happy Scotland! That nursery-land of Presbytery had emerged from the turmoil more Presbyterian than ever, a pattern to the whole world of Presbytery at its purest. In each of her thousand parishes walked the single accredited minister, with his kirk-session of lay-elders;

---

[1] Neal, III. 455, and IV. 13; Commons Journals, June 8, 1649 (provision to be made for Goodwin, Owen, and others), and July 2 (Owen's appointment to go with Cromwell); Notes from Council of State Order Books.

in each circle of contiguous parishes was the monthly Presbyterial Court; in each division of the country was the periodical Synod; and at the centre, reviewing all and commanding all, was the annual General Assembly in Edinburgh, represented through the rest of the year by the permanent Commission of the Kirk. Then how the Scottish Government co-operated with the Kirk, and listened to her advices, and, in everything except increasing her endowments, carried out her wishes! The Marquis of Argyle and his colleagues, almost all of them lay-elders of the Kirk, and with their hands in the affairs of the Kirk Assembly, the Kirk Commission, and all the minor Kirk judicatories, were, in spiritual and ecclesiastical matters, and in all the connexions of these with civil and social life, the disciples and factors of the Kirkmen. Where the Kirk judicatories laid on the spiritual lash, by excommunication or any minor sentence, there the State tribunals were ready, when necessary, with the hot iron and pincers of secular penalties. Never was a country under such discipline as Scotland was precisely in this year 1649, when it was governed by Argyle, Loudoun, Warriston, and the rest, in the name of the absent Charles II., abjuring and detesting the adjacent Commonwealth of England; and to this day historians of the Kirk must go back to that year if they would study Scottish Presbytery in its full flower and bloom. It was not merely that moral offences were watched and tracked out in every neighbourhood, through windows and keyholes, by a skilled police, and visited, when detected, with unsparing castigation; it was not merely that Sabbath-strolling, promiscuous dancing, card-playing, and the singing of profane songs, were made so difficult that their most passionate devotees were compelled to desist from them and find other amusements; it was not even that all the shires, and Fifeshire in particular, were scoured for secret dealings with the Devil, and there were more burnings of witches and warlocks in Scotland in this one year than in any other year of Scottish History. All this was much; but England herself, now that she was Puritanised, was not far behind Scotland in some of these respects. It was the absence of Religious

Dissent, the impossibility of Religious Dissent, that was the peculiar characteristic of Presbyterian North Britain. Not a man, not a woman, not a child, not a dog, not a rabbit, all over Scotland, but belonged to the Kirk, or had to pretend that relationship. No Independency, no Anabaptism, no Antinomianism, no Socinianism, no Familism, no Libertinism, no Scepticism, no Erastianism, no Sectarianism of any sort, no outcry for Toleration! The Kirk was the nation, and the nation was the Kirk. No garbling either of those Westminster Assembly documents which had been prepared as the standards and safeguards for the future of pure and perfect Presbytery. In God's Providence it seemed as if that great Assembly, though called by an English Parliament, held on English ground, and composed of English Divines, with but a few Scotchmen among them, had existed and laboured, after all, mainly for Scotland. With all the more zeal, because England had accepted but some of the fruits of the Westminster Assembly, had Scotland, with a touch or two of her own by the way, accepted them completely and universally. The *Directory of Worship*, approved by the General Assembly in Feb. 1645, had been established by Act of Parliament in the same month; and the *Confession of Faith*, approved by the General Assembly in Aug. 1647, with the *Larger Catechism* and *Shorter Catechism*, approved by the Assembly in July 1648, had been enacted by the Legislature together in Feb. 1648–9. Copies of all these the Scottish Commissioners had taken with them to the Hague; and they had made Charles II. a present of a volume in which they were superbly bound up for his perusal, together with the *National Scottish Covenant* and the *Solemn League and Covenant*. Charles was to be left under no mistake as to the creed and the laws of at least one part of his dominions.[1]

---

[1] Records of Scottish General Assemblies of 1647, 1648, and 1649; Balfour's Annals for 1649, and other Scottish Histories; Authorized Scottish Edition of *Confession of Faith*, &c.; Baillie, III. 86—87.

CHAPTER II.

MILTON'S ADHESION TO THE REPUBLIC: HIS *TENURE OF KINGS AND MAGISTRATES*: ANALYSIS OF THAT PAMPHLET: HIS ACCEPTANCE OF THE SECRETARYSHIP FOR FOREIGN TONGUES TO THE COUNCIL OF STATE: NATURE OF THE OFFICE: HIS FIRST ATTENDANCES AT THE COUNCIL AND FIRST OFFICIAL EMPLOYMENTS: EXTRACTS RELATING TO HIM FROM THE COUNCIL ORDER-BOOKS: HIS LETTER TO THE HAMBURG SENATE, &C.: LITERARY TASKS ASSIGNED HIM BY THE COUNCIL: *OBSERVATIONS ON ORMOND'S PEACE WITH THE IRISH AND ON THE SCOTCH PRESBYTERY OF BELFAST*: ACCOUNT OF THE PAMPHLET: CHANGE OF RESIDENCE TO CHARING CROSS: FRIENDS AND ACQUAINTANCES OF THIS DATE: HIS COMMISSION TO ANSWER THE *EIKON BASILIKE*.

MILTON was the first Englishman of mark, out of Parliament, that signified his unqualified adhesion to the Republic. This he did on the 13th of February, 1648–9, by publishing that pamphlet on which we saw him engaged in his house in High Holborn during the King's trial (Vol. III. pp. 718–719). The full title of the pamphlet, which consists of forty-two small quarto pages, was as follows:—*The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates: proving, That it is Lawfull, and hath been held so through all Ages, for any, who have the Power, to call to account a Tyrant, or wicked King, and after due conviction, to depose, and put him to death; if the ordinary Magistrate have neglected, or deny'd to doe it. And that they, who of late, so much blame Deposing are the Men that did it themselves. The Author, J. M. London, Printed by Matthew Simmons, at the Gilded Lyon in Aldersgate Street*, 1649. Matthew Simmons had been the publisher of Milton's Bucer Tract on Divorce, and probably of those five others of his previous pamphlets that had appeared without licence or printer's name. This new pamphlet, like most of its predecessors, was unlicensed. It was published exactly a fortnight after the King's death, and exactly a week after the Republic had been declared. The *Eikon Basilike*, the supreme publication on the other side, had preceded it by four days.[1]

The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates is not equal, in richness of literary interest, to the best of Milton's previous pamphlets. It is, however, a strong, thoroughly Miltonic performance, falling with hammer-like force on the question discussed; and it must have been welcomed by the founders of the Commonwealth in their first hour of difficulty.

The main purpose of the pamphlet, so far as it is theoretical, is to inculcate the Republican or Democratic principle. "No "man who knows aught," one paragraph opens, "can be so "stupid to deny that all men naturally were born free, being "the image and representation of God himself, and were by "privilege above all the creatures, born to command and not "to obey, and that they lived so till, from the root of Adam's "transgression, falling among themselves to do wrong and "violence, and foreseeing that such courses must needs tend "to the destruction of them all, they agreed by common "league to bind each other from mutual injury, and jointly "to defend themselves against any that gave disturbance "or opposition to such agreement. Hence came Cities, "Towns, and Commonwealths." Taking for granted this somewhat crude generalization of the facts of primeval history, and also the notion, then common, of an original social contract or compact as the basis of all states or polities, Milton proceeds to show how the first Kings and Magistrates arose, how these were necessarily only the deputy-justiciaries for the whole people, how they gradually forgot this and assumed the power to be their own, and how Laws had then to be invented, with Bonds, Councils, and Parliaments, to bridle Kings and maintain the common interests. This doctrine of the purely derivative nature of kingship, with such corollaries as that the titles of " Sovran Lord " and the like are mere arrogancies or flatteries, that the ideas of hereditary right and accountability to God alone are mere fictions, and that a people may, as they think fit, choose, change, or reject their Kings, is expounded at some length, with the usual references to Jewish and other histories, and with citations of Scripture, Euripides, Aristotle, Trajan, Theodosius, Justinian, Chrysostom, and other authorities.

---

[1] When I ventured (Vol. III. pp. 718—719) to assign the composition of this pamphlet of Milton, or the greater part of it, to the time of the King's Trial, or the week or so *preceding* his execution, I trusted merely to internal evidence and a subsequent reference to it by Milton himself in his *Def. Sec.* I am now confirmed beyond a doubt by having found the exact date of the publication in the Catalogue of the Thomason Collection in the British Museum.—There were later editions of the pamphlet, with "some additions," and appended Testimonies to its main proposition from Protestant Divines; and it is from these that there have been reprints in editions of Milton's collected Prose Works. In Simmons's edition of the Prose Works, however, the insertions in the later editions are marked by inverted commas. The title of the original edition, to the extent of the words quoted in the text, remained unaltered, though other words were added, signifying that there was new matter.

It having been established, as Milton thinks, that a people may, as they like, depose their Kings, even if they have not behaved badly, it follows *a fortiori* that they may depose Tyrants. The distinction between a King and a Tyrant is one to which Milton has been tending all the while, and on which he now lays considerable stress. If he took it directly from any one previous writer—which, in the case of a distinction so old and obvious, it is not necessary to suppose—it may have been from Buchanan, with whose famous dialogue *De Jure Regni apud Scotos*, addressed to James VI. of Scotland in 1579, there are other evidences of Milton's familiarity throughout the pamphlet. " A Tyrant, whether by wrong or right " coming to the Crown, is he who, regarding neither Law nor " the common good, reigns only for himself and his faction : " thus St. Basil, among others, defines him"; and Milton is content with the definition. Such a man is a common pest, and " the very principles of nature " tell that he may be dealt with as such. But, " because it is the vulgar folly of men " to desert their own reason, and, shutting their eyes, to " think they see best with other men's", Milton will produce examples and authorities. Was not Tyrannicide an open doctrine, and the deed an act of heroic virtue, among the Greeks and Romans? What says Seneca, through the mouth of Hercules the Tyrant-queller, in one of his Tragedies?—

"There can be slain
"No sacrifice to God more acceptable
"Than an unjust and wicked King."

Then is there no testimony from Scripture? Does not the right of Tyrannicide run through the Old Testament in such stories as those of Ehud and Eglon, Samuel and Agag, Jehu and Jehoram? David, indeed, refused to lift his hand against the Lord's Anointed; but that was in a private quarrel. Take then the New Testament. What texts there against unrighteous rulers, including that speech of Christ himself when the Pharisees had mentioned Herod: "*Tell that Fox*," &c. (Luke xiii. 32)! Descending into modern history, what do we find? The Emperor Ludovicus Pius, son of Charles the Great, acting as a judge in a dispute between a king and his subjects, giving his verdict for the subjects, and deposing the king; the Byzantine Emperor, Constantinus Leo, expressly recognising the responsibility of Kings to their subjects; and so on. But why range beyond the history of our own Island? Has no one read old Gildas? Have people forgotten the fact that comparatively recent English monarchs had the sword of St. Edward borne before them in their pomps, and the explanation of the same given by Matthew Paris? Will it be denied that the tradition of English Law is that the King may be judged by his Peers and Barons? Yes, it will be retorted, by his Peers and Barons! What is Milton's reply? "So much, I find," he says, "both in our own and foreign "story, that Dukes, Earls, and Marquesses, were at first not "hereditary, not empty and vain titles, but names of trust and "office and with the office ceasing, as induces me to be of "opinion that every worthy man in Parliament (for the word "Baron imports no more) might for the public good be "thought a fit peer and judge of the King, without regard "had to petty caveats and circumstances, the chief impedi-"ments in high affairs, and ever stood upon most by circum-"stantial men." The case of Richard II., of course, is quoted, with the opinions of Peter Martyr and others upon it.

Finally there is this bunch of later precedents, both British and Continental—the League of the Protestant Princes in 1546 against Charles V.; the bold conduct of the Reforming Scots to their Queen Regent in 1559, as related in Buchanan's History; the emphatic promulgation by Knox and Craig, in 1564, of the doctrine of the rights of subjects to call bad rulers to account; with the subsequent application of the doctrine by the Scottish Presbyterians to Queen Mary, whom they accounted it a leniency to depose and imprison only, inasmuch as their ancestors, for less crimes, had put their Kings to death. "These were Scotchmen and Presbyterians," Milton significantly adds: and, with equal significance, after having referred to the Revolt of the States of Holland from Philip of Spain in 1581, he says, "From that time to this no "State or Kingdom in the world hath equally prospered; but "let them remember not to look with an evil and prejudicial "eye upon their neighbours walking by the same rule."

Was Charles, however, in the category of Tyrants? This is assumed throughout, as a fact indisputable, and disputed by nobody. One passage condenses the substance of what Milton has to say on the point. It comes in connexion with the reference to the story of the assassination of Eglon, the fat King of Moab, after he had oppressed the Israelites eighteen years, by "Ehud, the son of Gera, a Benjaminite, a man left-handed," whom the Lord had raised up as their deliverer (Judges iii. 15–30). In disposing of the objection that the Tyrant killed in this case was a foreigner and invader, Milton says:—

> "It imports not whether foreign or native; for no Prince so native but professess to hold by Law; which when he himself overturns, breaking all the covenants and oaths that gave him title to his dignity, and were the bond and alliance between him and his people, what differs he from an outlandish King or from an enemy? For, look, how much right the King of Spain hath to govern us at all, so much right hath the King of England to govern us tyrannically. If *he*, though not bound to us by any league, coming from Spain in person to subdue or to destroy us, might lawfully by the People of England either be slain in fight

or put to death in captivity, what hath a Native King to plead, bound by so many covenants, benefits, and honours to the welfare of his People, why he, through the contempt of all Laws and Parliaments, the only tie of our obedience to him, for his own will's sake, and a boasted prerogative unaccountable, after seven years' warring and destroying of his best subjects, overcome and yielded prisoner, should think to scape unquestionable, as a thing divine, in respect of whom so many thousand Christians destroyed should lie unaccounted for, polluting with their slaughtered carcases all the land over, and crying for vengeance against the living that should have righted them? Who knows not but that there is a mutual bond of amity and brotherhood between man and man over all the world, neither is it the English Sea that can sever us from that duty and relation? A straiter bond yet there is between fellow-subjects, neighbours, and friends; but, when any of these do one to another so as hostility could do no worse, what doth the Law decree less against them than open enemies and invaders? Or, if the Law be not present, or too weak, what doth it warrant us to less than single defence or civil war? and from that time forward the Law of Civil Defensive War differs nothing from the Law of Foreign Hostility. Nor is it distance of place that makes enmity, but enmity that makes distance. He, therefore, that keeps peace with me, near or remote, of whatsoever nation, is to me, as far as all civil and human offices, an Englishman and a neighbour; but, if an Englishman, forgetting all laws, human, civil, and religious, offend against life and liberty, to him offended, and to the Law in his behalf, though born in the same womb, he is no better than a Turk, a Saracen, a Heathen. This is Gospel, and this was ever Law among equals: how much rather then against any King whatever, who, in respect of the People, is confessed inferior and not equal! To distinguish, therefore, of a Tyrant by *outlandish* or *domestic* is a weak evasion."

But how about the irregular steps, the armed violence, by which the King's Trial had been at last brought about? Briefly, but most decidedly, Milton indicates that he has no fault to find with the irregularity of the proceedings of Cromwell and his colleagues, but admires them to the utmost. Early in the pamphlet, after speaking of the occasional success which attends Civil War and Revolution in a just cause, and the complications that are sure to come with victory, he says: "Then comes the task to those worthies "which are the soul of that enterprise, to be swet and "laboured out amidst the throng and noises of vulgar and "irrational men, some contesting for privileges, customs, forms, "and that old entanglement of iniquity, their gibberish laws, "though the badge of their ancient slavery." Again, with a glance at Fairfax and others who had quailed at the very last: "Another sort there is who, coming in the course of "these affairs to have their share in great actions, above "the form of law or custom, at least to give their voice "and approbation, begin to swerve and almost shiver at "the majesty and grandeur of some noble deed, as if they "were newly entered into a great sin: disputing precedents, "forms, circumstances, when the Commonwealth nigh perishes "for want of deeds in substance, done with just and faithful "expedition. To these I wish better instruction, and virtue "equal to their calling: the former of which, that is to say "instruction, I shall endeavour, as my duty is, to bestow "upon them, and exhort them not to startle from the just "and pious resolution of adhering with all their strength "and assistance to the present Parliament and Army, in the "glorious way wherein Justice and Victory hath set them." Pride's Purge is defended, or mentioned passingly as hardly needing defence; and, on the whole, Milton does not forget the promise of the title of his pamphlet,—which was that he would maintain that, if the ordinary magistracy of a nation have neglected or refused to call a Tyrant to account, then it is lawful for "*any who have the power*" in that nation to do the deed.

Among the personalities of the pamphlet is a sneer at Prynne. He is dismissed as one of those "new apostate scare-"crows who, under show of giving counsel, send out their "barking monitories and *mementoes*, empty of aught else but "the spleen of a frustrated faction."[1] Not more polite is the notice of the letters on the King's behalf addressed to Fairfax by Dr. Henry Hammond and Dr. John Gauden.[1] Neither is named; but one, or other, or both, must be pointed at in the phrase: "the unmasculine rhetoric of any puling Priest "or Chaplain, sent as a friendly letter of advice, for fashion "sake in private, and forthwith published by the sender him- "self." But Milton's most vigorous onslaught, from first to last, is on the Presbyterians, and especially the English Presbyterian clergy.

---

[1] See, for Prynne's *Brief Memento*, and his other monitories, Vol. III. pp. 706—707, and 716.

The most notorious of the English Presbyterian demonstrations for the King at the last had been (1) *A Serious and Faithful Representation of the Judgment of the Ministers of the Gospel within the Province of London*, signed by forty-seven ministers at Sion College, including Case, Gataker, Gower, Roborough, and Wallis, of the Westminster Assembly, and addressed to Fairfax and the Council of War, Jan. 18, 1648–9,[2] and (2) *A Vindication of the London Ministers from the unjust aspersions upon their former actings for the Parliament*, signed a few days afterwards by fifty-seven ministers, including such additional members of the Westminster Assembly as Ashe, Burges, Calamy, Cawdrey, Corbet, Gouge, Seaman, Spurstow, Staunton, Temple, Thoroughgood, and Whitaker. In both documents the recent treatment of the King, and the proceedings of the Army generally, were witnessed against as irreligious, iniquitous, and contrary to the express obligations of the Solemn League and Covenant. But the second document went farther. It warned and exhorted all over whom the ministers had influence to abide by their vow in the Covenant, and not suffer themselves to be persuaded to sign the *Agreement of the People*—i. e. Ireton's Draft Programme for the Republic—subversive as it was of the "present constitution," and opening the way for "the toleration of all heresies and blasphemies." It earnestly prayed also that God would even yet "restrain the "violence of men," so that they might not "dare to draw "upon themselves and the Kingdom the blood of their sove- "reign." Besides the two printed London documents from

---

[1] Vol. III. p. 716.

[2] Vol. III. pp. 716—717.

Sion House, however, there had, doubtless, at the time of the King's sentence, been other Presbyterian protests in his behalf, from Lancashire and the country generally, as well as from London; and of these Milton must have heard. He cannot but have known also that many even of the Independent ministers, though of Republican sentiments, and favourable to the experiment of an English Republic, had been appalled by the bloody preliminary, and had either joined their Presbyterian neighbours in public remonstrance, or sunk into a mournful silence. To this day, indeed, apologists for Independency are anxious to show that the mass of the respectable Independent clergy, though they cordially accepted the Commonwealth when it was formed, had stood aloof from the actual decapitation of Charles.[1]

Not concerning himself with the hesitations or the panic there may have been among the Independent Divines, or wrapping up that subject in his general allusion to the good sort of weakish men that had swerved at the last, but were likely to redeem themselves, Milton directs all his open invective against the Presbyterians and *their* clergy.—In a paragraph at the end, addressed especially to Divines, his peculiar antipathy to the Presbyterian or Westminster Assembly type of the class, sufficiently expressed in prose and in verse since 1644, again breaks out. They are advised to "study harder" and not be content with "mounting twice into the chair "with a formal preachment huddled up at the odd hours of "a whole lazy week." They are advised also to hate "covet- "ousness," to hate "pluralities and all manner of Simony," and to leave off "rambling from benefice to benefice like "ravenous wolves seeking where they may devour the big- "gest." They are reminded that they ought to "be sorry "that, being called to assemble about reforming the Church, "they fell to progging and soliciting Parliament, though "they had renounced the name of Priests, for a new settling "of their tithes and oblations,"—a somewhat ungenerous summary, surely, even from Milton, of the history of the

---

[1] Neal's Puritans, III. 490—496; Halley's *Lancashire: its Puritanism and Nonconformity* (1869), I. 490—492, and II. 2—4.

Westminster Assembly. They are advised to "assemble in "consistory with their elders and deacons," each apart in his own proper parish, and not as "a pack of clergymen "by themselves to belly-cheer in their presumptuous *Sion*" (i. e. Sion House). There is also a distinct mention of their two London protests in the King's behalf. They are described as "the Printed Letters which they send, subscribed "with the ostentation of great characters and little moment." —While thus sarcastic on the Presbyterian clergy, he would not be too harsh on the Presbyterian Party generally. "As "for the Party called Presbyterian," he says, "of whom I "believe very many to be good and faithful Christians, "though misled by some of turbulent spirit, I wish them "earnestly and calmly not to fall off from their first principles." In other words, he begs them not to stultify their excellent past service, relapse into the arms of their old enemies, the Prelatists and Malignants, and impede the promising new Commonwealth, by clinging longer to that absurd Anti-Toleration principle which their clergy had stupidly and needlessly made the principle-paramount of Presbyterianism. "Let them not oppose their best friends and associates, who "molest them not at all, infringe not the least of their liberties,—unless they call it their liberty to bind other men's "consciences,—but are still seeking to live at peace with "them and brotherly concord."—These parting words to the Presbyterian clergy and the Presbyterians generally are but appended, however, to an indictment against the Presbyterians which had pervaded the whole pamphlet. "*That they* "*who of late so much blame deposing are the men that did it* "*themselves*" had been part of the thesis; and he had elaborated this part of the thesis with all his might. One can guess the drift of his argument. Protest as the Presbyterians now might, hold up their hands in horror as they might, join with the rest of the Royalist world as they might in clamours over the martyrdom of the Lord's Anointed, the true story of their own actions in leading to that event lay irrevocably in record, and Posterity would know it. Sophisticate as they might, wriggle as they might in the grasp of the facts, all men then living and all men yet to come would hold them responsible to the full for what had happened to Charles. Why did they sophisticate; why did they seek to escape amid *ex post facto* distinctions between his Majesty's person and his Majesty's office, and then between his Majesty's office as inherent in his person and the same as so far separable from his person? Why did they not accept the responsibility, as far as the deposition at least, and the rejection of the dynasty? This, or more than this, was what Presbyterians of the strong old days, Presbyterians of the Knox and Buchanan type, would have done and gloried in. But the old days were gone, and it was a weak-kneed generation of Presbyterians that had succeeded. All the more necessary that their quibblings should be exposed, and that, by way of warning to all weak-kneed men to keep off the stage of great public action in future, they should be confronted with a review of their real doings! This, accordingly, is Milton's purpose. "You yourselves did it: you "yourselves did it," is a phrase he repeats as often as he can, and is the text of page after page. The following passage is interesting as presenting his reasonings reduced to scholastic form, as well as to the form of historic summary:—

> "To prove it yet more plainly that they are the men who have deposed the King, I thus argue:—We know that King and Subject are relatives; and relatives have no longer being than in the relation; [and] the relation between King and Subject can be no other than regal authority and subjection. Hence I infer, past their defending, that, if the Subject, who is one relative, take away the relation, of force he takes away also the other relative. But the Presbyterians, who were one relative, that is to say Subjects, have for this seven years taken away the relation, that is to say the King's authority and their subjection to it: therefore the Presbyterians for these seven years have removed and extinguished the other relative, that is to say the King,—or, to speak more in brief, have deposed him, not only by depriving him the execution of his authority, but by conferring it on others. If then their oaths of subjection broken, new supremacy obeyed, new oaths and covenants taken, notwithstanding frivolous evasions, have in plain terms

unkinged the King, much more then hath their Seven Years' War not deposed him only, but outlawed him, and defied him as an alien, a rebel to Law, and enemy to the State. It must needs be clear to any man not averse from reason that hostility and subjection are two direct and positive contraries, and can no more in one subject stand together in respect of the same King than one person at the same time can be in two remote places. Against whom therefore the Subject is in act of hostility we may be confident that to him he is in no subjection; and in whom hostility takes place of subjection—for they can by no means consist together—to him the King can be not only no King, but an enemy. So that from hence we shall not need dispute whether they have *deposed* him, or what they have defaulted to him as no King, but show manfully what they have done toward the *killing* him.—Have they not levied all these wars against him, whether offensive or defensive (for defence in war equally offends, and most prudently beforehand), and given commission to slay where they knew his person could not be exempt from danger? And, if chance or flight had not saved him, how often had they killed him, directing their artillery, without blame or prohibition, to the very place where they saw him stand? Have they not sequestered him, judged or unjudged, and converted his revenue to other uses, detaining from him, as a grand delinquent, all means of livelihood, so that, for them, long since he might have perished, or have starved? Have they not hunted and pursued him round about the kingdom with sword and fire? Have they not formerly denied to treat with him, and their now recanting ministers preached against him, as a reprobate incurable, an enemy to God and his Church, marked for destruction, and therefore not to be treated with? Have they not besieged him, and, to their power, forbid him water and fire, save what they shot against him to the hazard of his life?"

Yes! but all this had been done subject to the oath taken in the Solemn League and Covenant of 1643, in the Articles of which "the honour of the King" had been expressly reserved, and Englishmen and Scotchmen together, though in the act of uniting against the King in the field, had sworn to endeavour "to preserve and defend the King's Majesty's person "and authority in the preservation and defence of the true "Religion and Liberties of the Kingdom." Milton (who had himself signed the Covenant) does his best to answer this objection, which was the incessant plea of the Presbyterians, and takes occasion at the same time to express his final opinion of the "riddling Covenant," and his estimate of the worth to England altogether of that famous invention of the Scots :—

> "No understanding man can be ignorant that Covenants are ever made according to the present state of persons and things, and have ever the more general laws of nature and of reason included in them, though not expressed. If I make a voluntary covenant, as with a *man*, to do him good, and he prove afterward a *monster* to me, I should conceive a disobligement [i. e. cancelling of the obligation]. If I covenant not to hurt an enemy, in favour of him and forbearance and hope of his amendment, and he, after that, shall do me tenfold injury and mischief to what he had done when I so covenanted, and still be plotting what may tend to my destruction, I question not but that his after actions release me, nor know I covenant so sacred that withholds me from demanding justice on him. Howbeit, had not their distrust in a good cause, and the fast and loose of our prevaricating divines overswayed, it had been doubtless better not to have inserted in a Covenant unnecessary obligations, and words (not works) of a supererogating allegiance to their enemy: no way advantageous to themselves had the King prevailed, as to their cost many would have felt; but full of snare and distraction to our friends: useful only, as we now find, to our adversaries, who under such a latitude and shelter of ambiguous interpretation have ever more been plotting and contriving new opportunities to trouble all again. How much better had it been, and more becoming an undaunted virtue, to have declared openly and boldly whom and what power the People were to hold supreme!"

Open and bold, beyond what may now appear, had been Milton's own conduct in publishing this pamphlet. Written mainly while the King was yet being tried, or was under sentence, and only touched here and there with additions after his death, so that throughout we are never quite sure whether the King is not still alive as we read, what did the publication of the pamphlet, a fortnight after the fact it defended, really imply? It implied not only that Milton had thrown in his lot with the Commonwealth, but also that he avowed himself a partisan of the Regicides, and was willing to abide all the consequences of that connexion. Actually, by his *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, he had attached himself more closely than any other person in England to the group of about sixty men, with Cromwell in their midst, who had constituted themselves the real Regicides by signing the Death-warrant or executing it. He had declared that, had it been necessary, his signature also would have been given to that Warrant.

What more natural than that such a man should be attached at once, in some capacity or other, to the Government of the New Commonwealth? This, accordingly, happened. Milton himself tells the story in his *Defensio Secunda*, written five years afterwards. "Concerning the Royal "Power," he there says, "nothing was written by me until "the King, having been voted an enemy by the Parliament, "and having been vanquished in war, was pleading his cause "as a prisoner before his Judges, and was capitally con-"demned. Then, at length, indeed, when certain Presby-"terian ministers, formerly most hostile to Charles, indignant "that the Independent party should now be preferred to "theirs, and should be more powerful in Parliament, were "raising a clamour over the sentence of the Parliament pro-"nounced upon the King (not that they were angry at the "deed, but because their own faction had not been the "agents), and as far as they could were promoting tumult, "daring to affirm that the Doctrine of Protestants and all "the Reformed Churches abhorred such an atrocious pro-"cedure against Kings, I, considering that such an open "falsehood ought to be publicly contradicted, did not even "yet write or advise anything concerning Charles indi-"vidually, but showed, with production of not a few testi-"monies of the chief theologians, what in a general way was "lawful against tyrants, and attacked, almost in propagandist "style (*prope concionabundus*), the gross ignorance or im-"pudence of men professing better things. That book did "not come forth till after the King's death, written as it was "rather for composing men's minds than for causing any "specific determination about Charles—a business belonging "not to me, but to the magistrates, and which had then "indeed been finished. All this service of mine, now to the "Church, now to the State" [Milton had enumerated, in the foregoing page or two, all his publications, from 1641 onwards, prior to his *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*] "I gave "gratuitously within my own private walls; from neither "Church nor State had I anything in return beyond personal safety; a good conscience, a good reputation with good "men, and this honest liberty of speech, were independent "possessions: some people about me were drawing wealth "to themselves, others honours, without trouble; but no one "ever saw me going about, no one ever saw me asking "anything among my friends, or stationed at the doors of "the Court with a petitioner's face, or haunting the entries "of lesser assemblies: I kept myself almost entirely at home, "managing on my own resources, though in this civil tumult "these were often in great part kept from me, and contriving, though burdened with taxes in the main rather "oppressive, to lead my frugal life. All this past and done, "imagining I should now have abundance of leisure, I turned "myself to the task of drawing out, if I could, in a continuous thread of narrative, the history of my country from "its first beginnings to these present times. I had finished "four books, when lo!, Charles's kingdom having been formed "into a Republic, the Council of State, as it is called, then "first set up by the authority of Parliament, invites me, "dreaming of nothing of the sort, to a post in connexion "with it, with a view to the use of my services chiefly in "foreign affairs."—Phillips, in his Memoir of Milton, repeats the substance of this passage, and adds that the office which his uncle was thus prevailed upon to accept was that of Latin Secretary to the Council for their Letters to foreign Princes and States.[1]

---

[1] Milton's *Def. Sec.* in Pickering's Edition of his Works, Vol. VI. pp. 292—293; and Phillips's Life of Milton (1694), pp. xxix, xxx.

We are fortunately able to give more precise details as to the manner and circumstances of Milton's appointment to the new office than he has himself communicated or Phillips knew.

On Tuesday, the 13th of March, 1648–9, exactly a month after the *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* had appeared, and the very day after Bradshaw had taken his seat for the first time as President of the Council of State, there were two meetings of the Council at Derby House. At the second or afternoon meeting there were present, besides Bradshaw, these fourteen members—Cromwell, Fairfax, Sir Henry Vane, Whitlocke, the Earl of Salisbury, the Earl of Denbigh, Sir Gilbert Pickering, Sir John Danvers, Sir Henry Mildmay, Sir William Masham, Mr. Heveningham, Mr. Lisle, Mr. Scott, Mr. Alderman Wilson, and Mr. Alderman Pennington. Among the items of business transacted, and minuted in the rough Order Book at the moment by the Secretary, Mr. Frost, were these two Resolutions:—(1) "That Mr. Whit-"locke, Sir Henry Vane, Lord Lisle [not present], Earl of "Denbigh, Mr. Marten [not present], Mr. Lisle, or any "two of them, be appointed a Committee to consider what "alliances this Crown hath formerly had with Foreign "States, and what those States are, and whether it will be "fit to continue those alliances, and with how many of the "said States, and how far they should be continued, and "upon what grounds, and in what manner applications and "addresses should be made for the said continuance." (2) "That it be referred to the former Committee to speak with "Mr. Milton, to know whether he will be employed as "Secretary for the Foreign Tongues, and to report to the "Council."—It is worth noting that at the same Council meeting there was a conversation about the immediate departure of the Prince Elector Palatine back to the continent, and about the parting civilities that would be proper on the occasion.[1]

Who suggested Milton to the Council of State? Bradshaw may possibly have been the person; but it may as well have been some other member of Council, who knew Milton, and had just read his *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates.*[1] It is certain, at all events, that Cromwell must have approved of the application to Milton. It was by *his* extraordinary exertions that the Council of State had been brought into working order; he had presided at its first meetings, and at most of the subsequent ones, till Bradshaw's appointment relieved him; the Council was not yet a month old; not an act it did but was of interest to Cromwell. The deputation that waited on Milton, however, in his house in High Holborn, to convey to him the desire of the Council, must have been one or two of the members that had just been appointed a Committee of Council for that very business of Foreign Embassies and Correspondence in connexion with which Milton's services were wanted; and of these one guesses Whitlocke or Vane, or both. Their interview with Milton must have been the very next day, Wednesday, March 14. What passed we can also guess generally.

---

[1] Order Books of Council of State for date given.

The proposal, as Milton informs us, took him quite by surprise. He was settling himself down again to purely literary work, hoping for undisturbed leisure under the Commonwealth to which he had given in his adhesion. The interruption or farther postponement of such work was a serious matter. Then there was the objection of his health. It had never been robust, and for the last few years it had been a constant source of trouble. Especially alarming was a growing weakness or dimness of sight, from no explicable cause, and with no external sign, but affecting the left eye already almost to its total disuse by candle-light, and making his first readings every morning painful or difficult. How would that infirmity suit with the official duties expected of him? Farther, of what were called business habits he was perfectly innocent, never having seen anything of office-work, the routine of committee-meetings, and such like, though perhaps, after all, there was no such mystery about these things but that one might have imagined them correctly enough. All this, with perhaps more, having been stated by Milton, and having been met with such answers as suggested themselves to his visitors (one of them, I fancy, being that the whole of Mr. Milton's time would by no means be required for the duties of the Secretaryship) Milton did give his consent.—The question of salary, I should say, was the last likely to be mentioned at the interview, and may not then have been mentioned at all. From the state of Milton's circumstances, indeed, that question cannot have been absolutely indifferent. The property left him by his father, consisting as it did of his native house, the Spread Eagle in Bread Street, and of one or two other London houses, besides something in money, and probably in some country bits of real estate, cannot have been altogether inconsiderable; and, shortly after the death of his father-in-law, Mr. Powell, in 1647, he had, in virtue of his claim on the Powell property for the residue of a debt of £500 due since 1627 (Vol. II. pp. 494–496), entered, by the legal process called "extent," into possession of certain cottages and small pieces of land, at Wheatley in Oxfordshire, that had belonged to Mr. Powell, with a title to hold the same till his debt, with damages and costs, should be satisfied. Out of these Wheatley revenues, however, he was making an allowance to Mrs. Powell of the thirds to which she was entitled by her widowhood; and, as he himself explains, there were other drawbacks, in the shape of rents actually intercepted by the deranged state of the country, heavy taxes, and other burdens, which reduced his income for the time to a simple sufficiency. No consideration of income, however, can have been his real inducement to accept the offered Secretaryship. That inducement, I believe, was a sudden exultation of spirit at the thought of being called to serve the great new Commonwealth in a place of trust, near its very centre, and seated in the very Council-room with its founders and chiefs.[1]

---

[1] Wood (Fasti, I. 484) says, "He was, "without any seeking of his, by the "endeavours of a private acquaintance, "who was one of the new Council of "State, chosen Latin Secretary".

---

[1] The particulars as to the state of Milton's income in 1649 are inferred from Aubrey's Notes, Phillips's Life, and documents in Mr. Hamilton's *Milton Papers*. We shall hear more about the Wheatley property.

On Thursday, March 15, there were again two meetings of the Council. At the morning meeting, besides Bradshaw in the Chair, there were present Cromwell, Fairfax, Whitlocke, Vane, Lord Lisle, Masham, Ludlow, Holland, Mildmay, Heveningham, Colonel Hutchinson, and, rather later, Robinson, Mr. Lisle, and Colonel Walton; and, *inter alia*, there was this order: "That Mr. John Milton be employed as "Secretary for Foreign Tongues to this Council, and that he "have the same salary which Mr. Weckherlyn formerly had "for the said service". This Mr. Weckherlyn, or more properly and fully Mr. George Rodolph Weckherlin, a German by birth, and now an oldish man, had been in official employment under Charles I. since the year 1628, if not earlier, but had passed into the service of the Parliament, and been Secretary for Foreign Tongues to the Joint Committee for the Two Kingdoms, established in February 1643–4.[1] His salary in the latter capacity had been, it seems, 15*s.* 10½*d.* a day, or £288 13*s.* 6½*d.* a year. That sum, therefore, equivalent to about £1000 a year now, was to be Milton's salary in his new post. The Council of State had in fact engulphed the Committee of the Two Kingdoms, and the work proposed for Milton under the Council was much the same as Weckherlin's had been under the former body. Milton does not seem to have been present when he was so appointed by the Council and his salary fixed: his consent to take the office had been simply reported by Vane or Whitlocke. It is memorable, however, that the day of Milton's appointment to be Secretary for Foreign Tongues to the Council was also the day of Cromwell's nomination to the command-in-chief in Ireland. The nomination was made by the Council at their afternoon sitting.

---

[1] Weckherlin's earlier career in England is to be traced through the published Calendars of State Papers from Feb. 1628—9, when he was Secretary to Lord Conway, then Chief Secretary of State, on to 1639, when he was in attendance on Secretary Coke in Charles's Expedition against the Scots. The most interesting entry concerning him I have found in these volumes is one of date Feb. 20, 1630—1. He then petitioned the King to "vouchsafe gracious ac-"knowledgment of his service, lest he "undo himself and his family thereby," and suggested, as one way of "refresh-"ing" for him meanwhile "in his hard "time," that the King might grant him the reversion of a patent which King James, in the eleventh year of his reign, had given to one of his footmen. It was a patent of the exclusive right to print Cicero's works in Latin, Virgil, Terence, Ovid, the Colloquies of Corderius, and certain other books. The patent to the footman had been for twenty-one years, and was about to expire; and Weckherlin petitions that it should be continued to him for thirty-one years more, and that three other books, which he names, should be included in it: "whereby he may get "some small competence, as the foot-"man did, by letting his grant to the "Stationers' Company." He did obtain the patent, March 28, 1631. Weckherlin had published at Stuttgart, in 1619, "A Panegyricke to the Lord Hays, "Viscount Dorchester, his Majesties of "Great Britaine Ambassadour in Ger-"many, sung by the Rhine;" and he had continued to dabble in authorship.

Tuesday, March 20, was the day of Milton's induction into his office. The Council of State had held no meeting in the interim; and at the meeting this day, Bradshaw not being able to be present at first, the *sederunt* began with only Sir William Armyn (probably voted into the chair), Whitlocke, Mildmay, Holland, Danvers, Scott, Jones, the Earl of Salisbury, Masham, and Constable, though ere long Bradshaw, Cromwell, the Earl of Denbigh, Sir James Harrington, Mr. Lisle, and Heveningham, also made their appearance. It was ordered at the meeting "That the Lord President "and any four members of this Council shall be a Committee "to administer the oath of secrecy unto such as shall be "employed as secretaries to attend this Council"; and, as the Chief or General Secretary, Mr. Walter Frost, sen., and his son, Mr. Walter Frost, jun., the Assistant Secretary, had already given their promises of secrecy a month before (February 22), and had been acting in their posts ever since, I infer that the order related to Milton, who had come to Derby House for the first time, and whose arrival had probably been announced by the door-keeper. On this supposition we can see Bradshaw and some four others of those present going out to receive Milton in the outer room where he was waiting, administering the oath to him there, and then returning and introducing the new Secretary to the Council. On that occasion, if not before, Milton may have first shaken hands with Cromwell.

Among the items of business at that meeting were instructions for two letters to be written, one to the Senate of Hamburg, and the other to Mr. Strickland, the English Resident at the Hague. These instructions, if I judge rightly from the entry of them in the Council Order Book, had been given before Milton came in; but he probably learnt at the meeting that the letter to the Senate of Hamburg would be in his department. So, at all events, it proved. At the Council meeting of Thursday, March 22 (one meeting having intervened), it was ordered "That the "letters now read, to be sent to Hamburg on behalf of the "Company of Merchant Adventurers, be approved, and that "they be translated into Latin by Mr. Milton." Frost, or some member of the Council, had drafted the letters in English, and Milton's first work in his Secretaryship was to be the translation of them into Latin.

When Milton became Secretary for Foreign Tongues to the Council of State, he had just entered on his forty-first year. The routine of his daily life was now to be regulated pretty much by the requirements of his office. When the Council had a morning meeting, it was generally at an early hour. Thus at the meeting at which Milton first appeared it was ordered "That this Council do meet to-morrow morning "at seven of the clock." Eight or nine o'clock seems to have been more common; but indeed the hours and times of the Council were very irregular. Some days there was no meeting at all; on others there were two, that of the afternoon protracted now and then to midnight. Early hours were no terror to Milton; but late and irregular hours may have been disturbing to his habits. He was not inconvenienced in this respect, however, so much as his two colleagues, Mr. General Secretary Frost and Mr. Assistant Secretary Frost. While their duties required them to be always present at the Council-meetings and during the whole sittings, Milton's were such that it would be enough if he were present at the beginning of each meeting, or looked in at each when he had reason to think his services might be wanted, always taking care to be at hand in case of a sudden summons. There are indications in the Order Books that, though Milton's attendance was very constant at first, matters gradually arranged themselves on some such understanding. Moreover, though the Council were very jealous as to any divulging of their proceedings, and Milton therefore may have had to draft important papers, and keep his drafts of them, if not in the Council-room itself, at least somewhere on the Council's premises, a good deal of his work, and perhaps more and more as the Council came to know him thoroughly, must have been such as he could do at home. This difference between the demand on Milton's time and the much heavier daily occupation of the two Frosts is represented fairly enough by their comparative salaries. The salary of the elder Frost was fixed (by the first order on the subject, at all events) at forty shillings *per diem*, or £730 a year—which was worth at least £2500 a year of our present money; that of the younger Frost at twenty shillings *per diem*, or £365 a year—worth £1250 a year at present; and they had an allowance for their four clerks of twenty-six shillings and eight pence *per diem*—which, if divided among the four equally, gave each of them the handsome clerk's pay of about a guinea a day in present value. Milton's salary of £288 13*s*. 6½*d*. a year, or about £1000 of our present value, was, therefore, less even than the younger Frost's and not half that of the elder. The difference, however, respected purely the relative weights of their duties, and did not define their relative ranks. Milton's position in the office was independent; in his special Secretaryship he was the elder Frost's co-equal; in all the business of that Secretaryship, and indeed, as we shall see, in other business in which the Council chose to employ him rather than Mr. Frost, he took his instructions direct from the Council. The way in which he and the Council managed business between them may easily be imagined. When anything in his department was going on in the Council, Milton would be present, listening to the discussion; and thus, while the elder or younger Frost took down any instruction given to Milton as part of the general minutes, he would himself carry away, in memory or on paper, such more particular notes as would serve him in the letter to be drafted or the paper to be prepared.—As regards those Letters to Foreign States and Princes, in the name of the Council or of the Parliament, the drafting of which was to be his most peculiar and dignified duty, Phillips credits the Council with having of their own accord formed a resolution which must have been very agreeable to Milton. "They stuck," says Phillips, "to this "noble and generous resolution, not to write to any, or re-"ceive answers from them, but in a language the most "proper to maintain a correspondence among the learned "of all nations in this part of the world, scorning to carry "on their affairs in the wheedling, lisping, jargon of the "cringing French, especially having a Minister of State able "to cope with the ablest any Prince or State could employ for "the Latin tongue." This is perhaps an exaggeration. Latin had already been in use, to some extent, in the correspondence of England with foreign nations; and it is rather to be conjectured that, if the Council of State did about this time put such signal honour upon the Latin, it was from no such linguistic pride as Phillips conceives, but from the necessities of the case. To read and translate all documents that came in French, Italian, Spanish, or Portuguese, Milton could, of course, undertake; even a German or Dutch letter, if obliged to it, he could attack with a dictionary; but, if he was to write to foreigners in any other tongue than English, it must be in Latin only. And so, in fact, though appointed by the title of *Secretary for Foreign Tongues*, Milton came to be called indifferently by that name or by the name of *Latin Secretary*.[1]

Better than any farther general description of Milton's position and duties in his Secretaryship will be the following series of annotated extracts from the Order Books of the Council of State, exhibiting his tasks and occupations in detail from March 22, 1648–9, when he was assigned as his first work the translation into Latin of the letters to be sent to Hamburg, to July 10, 1649, the day of Cromwell's departure for Ireland. They include, I think, every paragraph in the Order Books over those three months and a half in which Milton's name is mentioned, and also some in which he was involved though he is not named:—

---

[1] Order Books of Council of State generally, and of dates March 20, 1648—9, and July 4, 1649, for some of the facts mentioned; Phillips's Memoir (1694), p. xxx.

Monday, March 26, 1649 : *afternoon meeting.* Bradshaw and twelve more present, Henry Marten among them, but not Cromwell :—*Inter alia* Ordered (1) "That the letters now brought in "by MR. MILTON to the Senate of Hamburg be approved, and "that Mr. Isaac Lee, Deputy of the Company of Merchant-"Adventurers there, shall be appointed agent for the delivering of "them ;" (2) "That MR. MILTON be appointed to make some "observations upon a Paper lately printed, called *Old and New* "*Chains.*" This was, in reality, Lilburne's levelling manifesto, *England's New Chains Discovered,* the Second Part of which had been just two days out in London (see ante pp. 43, 44).

Wednesday, March 28 :—Present, Bradshaw, Cromwell, Marten, Armyn, Danvers, Holland, Mr. Lisle, Constable, Jones, Scott, Stapley, with Vane, Hasilrig, Popham, and Walton, as later comers :—*First item of business,* "That MR. MILTON be appointed "to make some observations upon the complication of interests "which is now amongst the several designers against the peace of "the Commonwealth ; and that it be made ready to be printed "with the Papers out of Ireland which the House hath ordered to "be printed." Explanation of this will be given presently : meanwhile it is to be noted that in the same Council meeting, later in the day, there was the tremendous scene in the Council room with Lilburne and his fellow-Levellers, Overton, Walwyn, and Prince (see ante pp. 45–47). Whether Milton remained to witness the scene can only be conjectured ; but, as he had just been appointed to make "some observations" on Lilburne's *New Chains Discovered,* for which the four had been arrested, and as the physiognomy and behaviour of a prisoner at the bar are very suggestive of "observations" to any one who has to write about him, it is most probable that he did. The following, at all events, is the minuted order of the Council after the tremendous scene was over :—"That "Lieutenant Colonel Lilburne be committed prisoner to the Tower "upon suspicion of High Treason for being the author, contriver, "framer, or publisher, of a certain scandalous and seditious Book "printed, entitled *England's New Chains Discovered,* &c., and that "a warrant be made out for his committal." The order was extended "upon the same ground" to Walwyn, Overton, and Prince.

Friday, April 20 (a small meeting) :—Ordered, "That the "letters brought in by Mr. Watkins be viewed by MR. FROST or "MR. MILTON, to see if any of them contain anything concerning "the exportation of any prohibited goods."

Monday, May 7 :—Bradshaw and fourteen more present, including Vane, and, later on, Cromwell and Fairfax :—"That Sir "Henry Mildmay do report to the House that they do find that "there are divers dangerous books printed and published with "the licence of Mr. Mabbott upon them, and that, upon the "examining of them, they find he *hath* given his licence to "divers of them; to desire the House therefore that he may be "discharged from that trust; and likewise to move the House that "care may be taken for the suppression of all such books and "pamphlets, and especially of that commonly known by the name "of *The Moderate*." The outbreak of the Army Levellers had then begun.

Saturday, May 12:—Bradshaw and eleven more present:—"That the Lord President do prepare and bring in an Act con-"cerning the prohibiting of the printing of invective and scandalous "Pamphlets against the Commonwealth."

Monday, May 14 (the day of the suppression of the Army Levellers at Burford: see ante p. 50):—Ordered (1) 'That the Pam-"phleteers [some persons, not now named, who had been taken "into custody] shall be discharged, they entering into a bond and "recognisance for their good abearance, and they paying the "messenger's charges." (2) "That Mr. Hall shall be employed "by this Council to make answer to such Pamphlets as shall come "out to the prejudice of this Commonwealth, and that he shall have "£100 *per annum* for his labour, with an assurance given him "from this Council that they will take further care of him; that "he shall sign the test signed by others employed by this Council; "and that he shall have £30 paid now unto him, in part of his "pension of £100 *per annum*."

Friday, May 18:—"That the French letters given in to the "House by the Dutch Ambassador be translated by Mr. Milton, "and the rest of the letters, now in the House, be sent for and "translated." This will be explained.

Wednesday, May 30 (eleven present):—"That Mr. Milton "take the papers found with Mr. John Lee and examine them to "see what may be found in them." Mr. John Lee was at the same time committed to the custody of the Serjeant at Arms.

Thursday, May 31:—Instructions to Alderman Pennington and Alderman Atkins to send for the author of a book called *The Papers which passed at Newcastle*, and to examine him concerning the Frontispiece of the said book, and thereupon to proceed farther against him, according to Law. The obnoxious Book must have been *The Papers which passed at Newcastle betwixt his Sacred Majesty and Mr. Alexander Henderson concerning the Change of Government* (see Vol. III. pp. 426–430). The book had been entered at Stationers' Hall a week before (May 23) as the copyright of the printer, Richard Royston; and it was out in London on the 29th of May. It was thought by the Royalists that these Papers would be a fine sequel to the *Eikon Basilike;* and some repetition of the famous frontispiece to the *Eikon* (ante p. 33) had been inserted in the new volume.[1]

---

[1] Stationers' Registers for date of registration of the *Papers*, and Catalogue of the Thomason Pamphlets for date of publication.

Monday, June 11, 1649:—Bradshaw and seventeen more present, including Cromwell, Vane, Marten, and Lord Grey of Groby: the fourth day after the Great London Thanksgiving for the suppression of the Levellers:—"That MR. MILTON and Mr. "Serjeant [Dendy] shall view the papers of Mr. Small, and deliver "out unto him such as are only of private concern, and the rest to "bring to this Council; and that Mr. Small shall have his liberty, "he putting in security to appear before this Council on Wednesday "sevennight; and that his plate, money, and goods, shall thereupon "be free from being kept under restraint or sealing up."

Saturday, June 23:—"That MR. MILTON do examine the "papers of *Pragmaticus,* and report what he finds in them to the "Council." *Pragmaticus,* of course, was the scurrilous *Mercurius Pragmaticus,* known very well to be Mr. Marchamont Needham (see ante pp. 37–39). He had just been arrested and his papers seized, by a warrant from Bradshaw, dated June 18.

Immerse these extracts in the narrative of events given in the preceding chapter, and a very clear idea will be obtained of Milton's Council of State occupations from March to July 1649. It is possible that the Minutes do not record every little piece of work assigned to him; but they must show the main lines along which his work was distributed.

Only two of the extracts, it will have been observed, contain items that can be ranged under the head of Correspondence with Foreign Powers:—I. The second of the entries under date March 26 approves of Milton's Latin letter for the Senate of Hamburg, and appoints Mr. Isaac Lee, Deputy of the Company of English Merchants at Hamburg, to deliver the same. The letter, the first specimen of Milton's official work, is still extant. "*Senatus Populusque Anglicanus Magnifico et Amplissimo Civitatis Hamburgensis Senatui Salutem,*" ("The Senate and People of England to the High and Most "Distinguished Senate of the City of Hamburg, greeting"): such is the address of this Epistle, which is dated "from the "Palace of Westminster, 2nd April, 1649, English style," ("*a Palatio Westmonasteriensi,* 2do *Aprilis, anno* 1649, *stylo* "*Angliæ*"), and signed "WILLIAM LENTHALL, Speaker of the "Senate and People of England," ("GULIELMUS LENTHALL, "*Senatus Populique Angliæ Orator*"). Milton's Letter, as approved of by the Council of State, had in fact been reported to Parliament by Henry Marten, March 30, for their approbation also, and had thus been converted into a public document, which the Speaker, as representing the whole Commonwealth, was authorized to sign. The Letter begins with a reference to the recently convulsed state of all Europe, and the civil distractions of England in particular, of which it does not doubt that the Hamburgers have sufficiently heard. Having, however, by the blessing of God, gone through so many woes and toils ("*tot ærumnis et laboribus Dei benignitate* "*perfuncti*"), and having converted the Monarchy into a Commonwealth and Free State, the English are now desirous of cultivating peace and friendly commercial relations with other peoples, and, having always had much traffic with the Hamburgers, write thus early to *them*. Mr. Isaac Lee is appointed English Agent at Hamburg, and has been instructed to communicate with the Senate and give them all information. It is hoped that the Honourable Senate will maintain with the new Government of England all the treaties and agreements hitherto subsisting between the two States, will continue to English merchants in Hamburg their privileges and immunities, and will be at some pains to protect them from the violence and insults of those of their own countrymen who are now scattered abroad as Royalist refugees and showing in every way their bitter hatred to the Commonwealth at home. Let the Hamburgers do this, and the Commonwealth will strive to return the obligation by every attention to Hamburg traders in England, and by other proofs of regard for the alliance of so honourable a City.—Such is the substance of the Letter, in Milton's fine and somewhat complex Latin; of which, however, we have to report that it was never delivered. "*Not delivered: sent back* "*by Lee*," is part of the endorsement of the actual copy sent to Hamburg, and now in the English State Paper Office. Lee had not found the Hamburgers in a state of mind for receiving such letters.—II. The other piece of international business in which Milton's hand was employed was the translation, by the Order of Council, dated May 18, of certain letters in French which had been delivered to Parliament by Joachimi, the Dutch Ambassador in Ordinary, who was still in London. On reference to the Commons Journals of that date one finds that the letters related to the murder of Dr. Dorislaus at the Hague a fortnight before, and to the probable effects of that event on the intercourse between England and the United Provinces. Joachimi had addressed a special letter to the Parliament, expressing his own horror, and that of his countrymen, at the outrage; and letters had also come from Mr. Strickland, the English Resident at the Hague, and from other persons, informing Parliament that the two Provincial States of Holland and West Friesland had denounced the outrage and promised their best care for the protection of Mr. Strickland from any such fate as had befallen his colleague. The House had expressed its satisfaction so far with this intelligence, and its hopes that the States-General would take action in the matter, as the two Provincial States had done, so that a "good correspondency" might continue between the two nations; but it had been referred to the Council of State to convey the sense of Parliament to Joachimi, and also to arrange for future diplomatic intercourse with the States-General, in the way that might be most fit. Hence the wish of the Council to have in their possession all the letters that Parliament had received on the subject; and hence the order to Mr. Milton to translate such of them as were in French.[1]

While those two items are all that we find registered of Milton's official work at first in that business of Correspondence with Foreign Powers which belonged properly and expressly to his Secretaryship, he was engaged, it appears, till the Foreign Powers should give him more to do, in whatever odds and ends of other business might occupy his time.

---

[1] *Milton Papers from the State Paper Office*, by W. Douglas Hamilton (Camden Society, 1859) pp. 15—18; Commons Journals, March 30 and May 18, 1649. The series of Milton's *State Letters*, as printed now in editions of his works (more complete in the MS. packet, now in the State Paper Office, in which Milton left them for the press), does not begin till August 1649: from which date only had he kept copies, or considered the dispatches themselves worthy of preservation. The first Hamburg Epistle, easily identified by its date, was found among the miscellaneous Letters of Foreign Correspondence in the State Paper Office; and Mr. Hamilton imagines that Milton either had taken no duplicate of this letter, or rejected it from his series of duplicates as never having been delivered.

The Council of State and Parliament had, from the establishment of the Commonwealth, as we have seen, been very vigilant of the press. Parliament, we may now say, had even been troubled by the fact that an edition of the Koran in English, licensed by Mr. Downham, was being printed in London, and had ordered the seizure of the stock, and apprehension of the printer, and referred farther action to the Council.[1] That was too absurd, and the Council had seen it to be so. Beset, however, with Royalist pamphleteers on the one hand and Levelling pamphleteers on the other, the Council had been vigorous, on its own account, in bringing some of the most notorious of such political offenders, or the printers who aided them, into custody. The strictness may have been necessary on grounds of the merest police, for some of the pamphlets and current newspapers were not only seditious, but also abominably indecent. Necessary or not necessary, however, participation in this kind of work can have by no means been congenial to the author of the *Areopagitica.* Yet, hardly had he been inducted into his Secretaryship when the Council seem to have expected his help even here. The papers referred to him or Mr. Frost for examination (April 20), and Mr. Small's papers, referred to Milton and the Serjeant-at-Arms (June 11), were probably not of a literary kind: but one suspects the purport of the entry about Mr. John Lee's papers (May 30); the order about the papers of *Pragmaticus* (June 23) is unmistakeable; and there is a sense of incongruity in the general fact, represented conspicuously in the entries of March 28, and May 7, 12, 14, and 31, that so much of the Council's activity, just after Milton had been introduced into it, should have run in the direction of a severer supervision of Books and Pamphlets, and a new Press Law of Bradshaw's making. It was a difficult situation; but Milton, I have no doubt, behaved in it consistently with himself. The *Areopagitica* had not committed him to the doctrine of the Liberty of the Press in the sense that everything or anything might be published with impunity. He had allowed, in a general way, that the publishers of writings deemed dangerous to the State might be called to account after the fact; and he had expressly asserted that there might justly be a law against all anonymous authorship, or at least against anonymous printing. To examine and report on publications referred to him by the Council was, therefore, however uncongenial, not necessarily un-Areopagitic. One may even discern some influence of the author of the *Areopagitica* in assuaging the temper of the Council on the subject of Press-offences. Lilburne and his three associates were, of course, in a category by themselves: they were State-criminals reserved for trial. *Pragmaticus* or Needham, again, had been so long at large as a libeller that, if the result of Milton's examination of his last libels was to detain him under lock and key for a time, nobody can have been surprised.[1] One notes, however, the discharge (May 14) of the minor and unnamed "Pamphleteers"; and especially one notes the avoidance by Milton of anything implying censorship of writings before publication. Moreover, what is one to make of the action of the Council in the case of Mr. Mabbott, as recorded in the order of the 7th of May? This gentleman had been a licenser of pamphlets since 1644; he had been expressly confirmed or reappointed in that post, by recommendation of Fairfax and the Army, in 1647; and, as news-sheets were his peculiar charge, he had given his *imprimatur* to perhaps a larger number of individual publications than had been passed by any other licenser in England (see Vol. III. p. 432). He had come, it appears, to be very lax in his notions of what might be published; and the Council, finding that this was the case, had recommended to the House that he should be discharged from his trust. The House, we find from its Journals, did discharge him, as desired, May 22, referring to the Council at the same time the business of preparing some new and efficient Press-Act. So far, it might seem that Mabbott was in disgrace, and that some sterner man was to be put in his room. There is, however, another version of the story. Mabbott had become a convert to Milton's principle of the Liberty of Unlicenced Printing; he had consequently been uncomfortable in his office, and had let the fact be known, months ago (Vol. III. p. 432, note); and now he had himself begged his discharge, on the ground that "Licensing is as great a monopoly as ever was in this "nation, in that all men's judgment and reasonings are to "be bound up in the Licenser's." If Mabbott was dismissed, therefore, may it not have been in part because his conduct had suggested to the Council the question whether the censorship might not be a farce? In fact, may it not have begun to dawn upon the Council that Mr. Milton's ideas were right to some extent, and that, while the power of suppressing dangerous publications must be retained, censorship before publication was hardly the right method?[1]

---

[1] Commons Journals, March 19 and 21, 1648—9. In the Stationers' Registers Mr. White, a bookseller, enters "The "Turkish Alcoran" as his copyright, under date Dec. 29, 1648. This must be the book. Publication had been delayed.

---

[1] Mr. W. Douglas Hamilton (*Milton Papers*, p. 28) mentions that there is a copy of No. 53 of *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, i.e. the number for May 1—8, in the State Paper Office, and suggests that, as it is the only number of the periodical preserved there, it may be the one which Milton more particularly examined and reported on. He adds, "Its contents "appear to warrant the conclusion." This is probable enough; but any of the recent numbers of *Pragmaticus* would have served the turn, and I have already (ante p. 54) given a characteristic quotation from a later number than the one in question (May 29—June 5). I have seen also an intermediate number—that for May 8—15. It is full of scurrility as usual; calls the Council "The Jugglers of Derby House" (so they had not then gone to Whitehall); is in great glee over the difficulties with Lilburne and the Levellers; and speaks exultingly, though not with absolute approval, ot the murder of Dorislaus.

More honourable in itself, and more to Milton's taste, than the examination of hostile publications with a view to their prosecution and suppression, was the task of openly defending the Republic in reply to the best or worst of them. Nor were the Council slow to avail themselves, in this way, of the splendid literary powers of their Latin Secretary. Other pens, indeed, had appeared in defence of the Commonwealth, and even of the Regicide, since the publication of Milton's *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*[2]; but what pen could compete with his? Therefore hardly had Milton assumed his secretarial office when at least three literary tasks in the interests of the Commonwealth were assigned him by the Council. Nothing is said in the Order Books of by far the most important of the three; but we have Milton's own assurance, twice repeated, that he was ordered or requested by the Council to prepare something in reply to the *Eikon Basilike*.[1] There was, then, a distinct understanding on that subject, though it was not registered, and the performance might wait Milton's leisure. The other two literary commissions, however, are duly registered in the Order Books, and were more pressing and immediate. By minute of March 26, 1649, when Milton had been but six days in office, he was instructed to write something about Lilburne's *New Chains Discovered;* and, two days later, he was instructed to write something about the "complication of interests" then discernible "among the several designers against the peace of the "Commonwealth," and to have it ready to be printed with certain Papers which Parliament had received from Ireland.

---

[1] Commons Journals, May 22, 1649; and Godwin's Commonwealth, III. 342. Godwin quotes Mabbott's reasons against the Censorship from the *Perfect Diurnal*, No. 304.

[2] Among the defences of the Regicide and establishment of the Commonwealth most closely following Milton's *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* (Feb. 13, 1648–9) I have noted the following:—*Reasons to Resolve the Unresolved People of the Legality of the King's Trial and Judgment: by Rob. Robins* (Feb. 26: printed for Robert White, and licensed by Mabbott); *The City Ministers Unmasked, or the Hypocrisy of Fifty-nine of the most eminent of the Clergy in and about London* (March 5);

The Resolve continued, or Satisfaction to some Scruples about the putting of the late King to death (March 12); *The Lawfulness of obeying the present Government* (April 25); *The Snare is Broken: wherein it is proved, by Scripture, Law, and Reason, that the National Covenant and Oath was unlawfully given and taken: by John Canne* (May 1); *King Charles his Trial justified by Col. Robert Bennett* (May 9); *The Obstructors of Justice opposed, or a Discourse of the Honourable Sentence passed upon the late King by the High Court of Justice: by John Goodwin* (May 30). I take the dates from Thomason; and I know some of the pamphlets themselves only by their titles. The last, by John Goodwin, is the most important. It is in 146 pages, small quarto, with a portrait of the author prefixed, and is addressed "to the Right Hon. the Commons of "England assembled in Parliament." Goodwin goes over the whole ground, discusses the objection from the Covenant, replies to the Presbyterians (citing against them their own *præsidium et dulce decus*, the Scottish Rutherford, in his *Lex Rex*), and quotes Milton's *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* several times with great respect. It appears from this book that Goodwin *had* seen the late King before his execution, though I had accepted the tradition to the contrary (Vol. III. p. 721). Speaking of the marvellous ability and graces, the seraphic majesty, with which people were now crediting the dead monarch, chiefly in consequence of the *Eikon Basilike*, he says, "By that hour's dis-"course or more with him whereunto "both he, I conceive, as well as myself, "were rather importuned by others than "led by either of our respective desires, "a few days before his death, I found "an experiment of truth in that common "saying, *Minuit præsentia famam:* "'What fame makes great presence "finds less to be'": i.e. Charles had not impressed Goodwin, even in those solemn moments, nearly up to his expectations.

[1] In the Preface to the *Eikonoklastes*, when it was published in Oct. 1649, Milton spoke of it as "a work assigned "rather than by me chosen or affected"; and in his *Def. Sec.* (1654), speaking of the *Eikon Basilike*, he says distinctly, "Huic respondere *jussus*, Iconi Icono-"clasten opposui."

A tract on John Lilburne and the Levellers by the future author of Paradise Lost would have been very interesting; but nothing of the kind has come down among Milton's acknowledged prose-writings, nor have I found among the pamphlets of the time anything that can be regarded as Milton's fulfilment of his commission to write something about *New Chains.* Two pamphlets, indeed, did come out, so exactly in the strain of half-pitying rebuke in which the Council of State would have thought it best to treat Lilburne and the Levellers in print that one can hardly doubt that the Council and even Milton had cognisance of both.—One, published May 18, by "Peter Cole, at the sign of the Printing "Press in Cornhill, near the Royal Exchange," was entitled *A Serious Aviso to the good people of this nation concerning that sort of men called Levellers.* It professes to be by "J. Philo-"laus," and has a motto from Juvenal on its title-page. It begins, "Dear Fellow Citizens, when I consider the strange "dispensations of Providence upon us of this Nation, I cannot "but be swallowed up in admiration and deepest acknow-"ledgement how it hath been pleased to scourge us with "light afflictions, and notwithstanding bless us with such "transcendent mercies as we should hardly have dared to have "wished." There follows a defence of Parliament and the Army, with comments on the Levellers and their principles. "This sort of men," it is said, "who (like other factions, "content in time to wear those names which the scorn of "others first put upon them) are called *Levellers*, were at first "mingled with the best patriots and assertors of our freedom: "and, if they themselves had not violently burst forth, there "had never been known a separation; but they had, equally "with *them*, shared the glory of our Settlement, and never "been noted common disturbers." The worst character given of them is that they are "all of them but private "men, utterly unversed in government, and some of them "of boisterous and turbulent natures." When these comments came out the Army-Levellers had been already suppressed by Fairfax and Cromwell; but the comments must have been written before that fact was known.—The other

Pamphlet appeared on the 2nd of June, when the suppression of the Army-Levellers was notorious, but Lilburne and his associates were still appealing to the public in tracts from their prison in the Tower. It professes to be by "some private persons, well-wishers to the just and honourable proceedings of the Parliament and Council of State," and to be published "by authority"; the printer is Matthew Simmons of Aldersgate Street, the publisher of Milton's *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, and now the recognised printer-in-chief for the Commonwealth; and the title is "*The Discoverer: wherein is set forth, to undeceive the Nation, the real Plots and Stratagems of Lieut.-Colonel John Lilburne, Mr. William Walwyn, Mr. Thomas Prince, Mr. Richard Overton, and that Party.*" In the text of the Pamphlet the published account by Lilburne and his fellows of their appearance, March 28, before the Council of State is quoted at length, together with the report of Cromwell's speech in the Council, as overheard by Lilburne outside, when he listened at the keyhole: "I tell you, Sir, you have no other way to deal with these men but to break them to pieces" (see ante pp. 46, 47); and the quiet and very sensible comment is "Now, "be it so that he hath thus spoken, what hath he done? "was there not a cause? Is not the thing true, and very "necessary it should be done?"—That Milton had a direct hand in either of these pamphlets is disproved by the poverty of their style. My conjecture is that he deferred his "observations" on Lilburne's *New Chains*, ordered by the Council March 26, till they were no longer necessary. The shooting of the trooper Lockyer in St. Paul's Churchyard (April 26) and the suppression of the organized Mutiny at Burford (May 14) were Cromwell's more effective "observations" on that subject; and whatever of paper argument against Lilburne and the Levellers might still be needed might be conducted by more ordinary pens than Milton's. A "Mr. Hall," we have seen, was appointed by the Council of State, May 14, as their hack-writer, at £100 a year; and it seems fair to interpret the fact as a release to Milton, at his own request, not only from the task of replying to Lilburne's

New Chains, but also from any other literary drudgery of the same sort. Mr. Hall may have officiated in the two above-mentioned pamphlets, or at least in the second of them.[1]

The other task, defined vaguely hitherto as the preparation of something on "the complication of interests" in the enemy's camp, to go to press with certain Irish papers, was duly performed by Milton himself. The following extract from the Commons Journals of March 28 (the very day the task was assigned to Milton) will make the whole business clear. "*Ordered* That the Letter sent by the Earl of Ormond "[his Marquisate not allowed] to Colonel Jones, Governor "of Dublin, and the Answer of Colonel Jones thereunto, and "the Articles between the Lord Ormond and the General "Assembly of the Roman Catholics of Ireland, be forthwith "printed and published; and that it be recommended to the "Council of State to give directions for printing the same, "and to take into consideration the votes of this House "thereupon, and of the Paper entitled 'A Presentation of "'the Presbytery of Belfast,' and what is further fit to be "done thereupon, and to prepare and publish a Declaration "of the sense of the Parliament upon the whole, together "with the Letters and Articles." The House, in fact, had been discussing that day the state of Ireland as we have described it ante pp. 22–25, with the exact papers before them there mentioned: viz. *Ormond's Articles of Peace with the Irish Rebels*, of date Jan. 17, 1648–9; the Presbytery of Belfast's *Necessary Representation of the Present Evils*, of date Feb. 15 (sent over by Monk from Dundalk); *Ormond's Proclamation of Charles II.*, of date Feb. 26; *Ormond's Letter to Colonel Michael Jones*, of March 9, tempting him to betray the Parliament and declare for Charles II.; and *Colonel Jones's Answer to Ormond*, March 14, refusing to do anything of the kind. Resolutions had been come to, condemning the Articles of Peace with the Rebels and declaring Ormond guilty of High Treason on account of them, and approving of the faithful conduct of Colonel Jones; but the House had been struck with the complex condition of Irish affairs represented in the documents before it—that "jumble of Irish Elements," as we called it, which was exhibited in the strange rallying of the Irish Roman Catholics on the one hand and the Scottish Presbyterians of Ulster on the other round Ormond and his Anglo-Irish Royalists. This was what they meant by "the complication of interests"; and they thought the phenomenon so important that, in referring Ormond's *Articles of Peace* and the other documents to the Council of State for immediate publication, they desired the Council to prepare some express observations on the subject, which might accompany the documents and enlighten the public mind. At once, we have seen, the Council did the wisest thing possible by committing the work to their Latin Secretary. Altogether, Parliament itself having virtually given the command, it was not a work to be neglected or postponed. Six weeks elapsed, however, before Milton, amid his other employments, had the Irish documents, with his commentary on them, fairly through the press. They were published on the 16th of May, 1649, in a small octavo of sixty-five pages, with this title: "*Articles of Peace, made and concluded with the Irish Rebels, and Papists, by James Earle of Ormond, for and in behalfe of the late King, and by vertue of his autoritie. Also a Letter sent by Ormond to Col. Jones, Governor of Dublin, with his Answer thereunto. And A Representation of the Scotch Presbytery of Belfast in Ireland. Upon all which are added Observations, Publisht by Autority. London; Printed by Matthew Simmons in Aldergate streete*, 1649." The Documents take up the first forty-five pages of the volume, and the remaining twenty are devoted to the Commentary. This, which is the only part of the volume properly Milton's, though the Documents are usefully included with it in editions of his whole works, bears the separate title of *Observations upon the Articles of Peace with the Irish Rebels, on the Letter of Ormond to Col. Jones, and the Representation of the Presbytery at Belfast.* Milton's name is not given. He was writing, it is to be remembered, as the spokesman of the Government.[1]

---

[1] Copies of the two cited Pamphlets in the Thomason Collection. In the Royalist *Mercurius Elencticus*, No. 27 (Oct. 29—Nov. 5, 1649), I find Milton's printer, Matthew Simmons, described as "the Council of State's factotum".

The *Observations* divide themselves into three parts, corresponding to the three objects of criticism. These are (1) the Articles of Peace themselves, (2) Ormond's Letter to Jones, (3) the Belfast Presbytery.

The Articles of Peace, described as "made with those inhuman Rebels and Papists of Ireland by the late King as one of his last masterpieces," are first denounced in gross as an unpardonable condonation of the Massacre of 1641, and a treason to the rights of England over Ireland. The charge is then illustrated by comments on several of the more important Articles individually. "These [Irish], therefore," he says, "by their own foregoing demerits and provocations "justly made our vassals, are by the 1st Article of this Peace "advanced to a condition of freedom superior to what any "English Protestants durst have demanded." The 2nd Article is next condemned for its repeal of Poyning's Act, by which no Irish Parliament could be summoned, and no bill passed by such, but with allowance under the Great Seal of England. Among the other Articles marked for special condemnation is the 9th, conceding to the Irish Roman Catholics the right of maintaining and independently managing an army of 15,000 foot and 2500 horse. Nothing is said directly on the subject of the Irish Church-Establishment, or the amount of toleration that it might be wise for the Commonwealth to accord to the Roman Catholic Religion in Ireland; it is the idea of the possible political independence of Ireland that is denied and scouted. Over a curious provision in the 22nd Article Milton becomes grimly facetious. The Irish peasants, it seems, were strongly attached to two old customs of theirs, called "the ploughing with horses by the tail," and "the burning of oats with the straw"; and, to please the peasants, the Kilkenny powers had stipulated with his Majesty, while arranging for Irish Independence generally, that certain Acts forbidding these customs should be repealed. What a proof, says Milton, of the incorrigible savagery of the people Ormond proposed to enfranchise, and what an omen of the absurd future of Ireland if it were left to the Irish themselves!

---

[1] Commons Journals and Council Order Book of March 28, 1649; and copy of the *Articles of Peace and Observations* in the Thomason Collection in British Museum (E—555). The date "May 16" is marked in MS. on the title-page of that copy.

Passing to Ormond's Letter to Jones, Milton has more opportunity for animadversion on Ormond personally. The mere attempt on the fidelity of Jones, "which the discretion and true worth of that gentleman hath so well answered and repulsed," might, he says, have passed without notice, but for Ormond's digression in his Letter into reproaches against the English Parliament and Army. "They were the subverters of true Religion," Ormond had said, "the protectors and inviters not only of all false Religions, but of Irreligion and Atheism." A pretty accusation, says Milton, to come from a man who was setting up Antichrist in Ireland, by handing over the whole social regulation of that Island to the Pope and Church of Rome! What had the English Parliament done? Had it not discountenanced Popery as much as it could, confining Papists "to the bare enjoyment "of that which is not in our reach, their consciences"? Had it not encouraged all true ministers of the Gospel, and even endowed and established a national Ministry, only stopping short of conferring upon them that power of the civil sword, that right to persecute dissenters and compel them to conformity, which some of them had wanted? This Toleration policy of the Commonwealth, of course, was what Ormond was pointing at hypocritically, *ad captandum* the Presbyterians. Here Milton is once more on his favourite topic. "To say there-"fore that we protect and invite all false Religions, with Irre-"ligion and Atheism, because we lend not, or rather misapply "not, the temporal power to help out, though in vain, the "sloth, the spleen, the insufficiency, of Churchmen in the "execution of spiritual discipline over those within their "charge, or those without, is an imputation that may be laid "as well upon the best regulated States and Governments "through the world." If, indeed, there are in England any "declared Atheists, malicious enemies of God and of Christ," the Parliament, Milton thinks, "professes not to tolerate such, but with all fitting endeavours to suppress them"; but to exclude from its protection all who might be laxly and popularly taxed with Irreligion or Atheism would be a policy of which some of the highly religious persons who recommended it might very soon themselves feel the smart.—Ormond's insinuation that the English were drifting through anarchy to a Turkish tyranny is then noticed, with his anticipation of the part that "Cromwell or some such John of Leyden" might play in the course of the change (ante p. 25). The insult to Cromwell rouses Milton strongly. "Seeing in that which follows," he says of Ormond, "he contains not himself, but, contrary to what a gentleman should "know of civility, proceeds to the contemptuous naming of "a person whose valour and high merit many enemies more "noble than himself have both honoured and feared, to assert "*his* good name and reputation of whose service the Common-"wealth receives so ample satisfaction, 'tis answered in his "behalf that CROMWELL, whom he couples with a name of "scorn, hath done in few years more eminent and remarkable "deeds whereon to found nobility in his house, though it were "wanting, and perpetual renown to posterity, than ORMOND "and all his ancestors put together can show from any record "of their Irish exploits, the widest scene of their glory."—Ormond's phrase "the scum and dregs of the House of Commons," Milton concludes, would have been impudent from an Irishman in his best estate, but was ludicrous from an Irishman then at the head of such "a mixed rabble, part Papists, part fugitives, and part savages." Unable to say much, however, in reply to Ormond's remark on the small number of persons remaining in the English Parliament and administering the Commonwealth, Milton is judiciously silent on that point.

If John Lilburne escaped the honour of a rebuke from the future author of Paradise Lost, that honour was enjoyed to the full by the Presbytery of Belfast. The names of the persons who composed that venerable body in Feb. 1648–9 might, I suppose, be easily ascertained. Enough for us that they were a few ministers and lay-elders of the Scottish colony in Ulster who felt themselves called upon to imitate the example of the Presbyterian ministers of London, and of the Commission of the Scottish Kirk in Edinburgh, by publishing to the Ulster Scots, and to all the world besides, their protest against the execution of Charles, the change of the Monarchy into a Republic, and all "the late and present practices of the Sectarian Party in England." This Party, they explained, had broken the Covenant, had opposed Presbyterial Government, "the hedge and bulwark of Religion," and were now embracing "even Paganism and Judaism in the arms of Toleration"; and, though they would not suggest to the Scots of Ulster any line of practical conduct in consequence, and "would not be looked upon as sowers of sedition or broachers of national and divisive motions," they thought it their duty to fortify their own flocks at least with a few general advices. "What mean these men?" retorts Milton, after reading their published Paper. "Is the Presbytery of "Belfast, a small town in Ulster, of so large extent that their "voices cannot serve to teach duties in the congregations "they oversee, without spreading and divulging to all parts, "far beyond the diocese of Patrick or Columba, their written "Representation?" Again, "We did not think that one classic "fraternity, so obscure and remote, should involve us, and all "State-affairs, within the censure and jurisdiction of Belfast"; and so on in other phrases of contempt for such a word-valiant manifesto "from a barbarous nook of Ireland." He discusses, nevertheless, the points of their manifesto. The Trial and Execution of the King, they said, was without rule or example. Why, besides being brutally ignorant of General History, "these blockish Presbyters of Clandeboy know not "that John Knox, who was the first founder of Presbytery in "Scotland, taught professedly the doctrine of deposing and of "killing Kings." On the topics of the Covenant and Toleration Milton repeats himself, with but one home-thrust for the Belfast Scots. The English Sectarian Army and its principles of Toleration! Why, that the Argyle Government and ultra-Presbyterian Whiggism were at that moment existing in

Scotland itself was very much the doing of this English Sectarian Army. Had not the Argyle Whigs been sectarians in Scotland themselves when Hamilton and the Engagers were in power, and had not Cromwell's victory over the Engagers reinstated them? As for the pretence of the Belfast Presbyters that they abstained from direct interference in Irish politics, what was the news from Ireland even while Milton was writing? What but that the Scottish inhabitants of Ulster were up in arms for Charles II., besieging Londonderry, and acting in a manner as the allies of Ormond and the Irish Papists, "and all this by the incitement and illusions of that un-Christian Synagogue at Belfast?" How would the Ulster Presbyterians answer to God, how would they answer to their own eternally-cited Covenant, for that combination?

At the time of Milton's appointment to the Secretaryship for Foreign Tongues, he was living in the small house in High Holborn, looking backward into Lincoln's-Inn-Fields, to which he had removed in 1647, when he broke up his school-establishment in Barbican after his father's death. Hardly had he begun his official duties, however, when he found even the short distance between High Holborn and the Whitehall neighbourhood inconvenient. He took temporary lodgings, therefore, "at one Thomson's, next door to the Bull Head Tavern at Charing Cross, opening into the Spring Garden." Whether this Thomson was any relative of his "Christian friend" Mrs. Catherine Thomson, on whose death in Dec. 1646 he had written a sonnet, is mere matter of guess. Edward Phillips, who informs us of the change of his uncle's domicile, is the less distinct in his particulars because he was not any longer with his uncle at the time. He had gone, at the age of eighteen years and a half, to complete his education at the now reformed University of Oxford, and had entered at Magdalen Hall, the new master of which was Dr. John Wilkinson, in March 1648–9. The younger brother, John Phillips, however, seems still to have remained with his uncle. If the whole family, therefore, were transferred from

High Holborn to Thomson's house at Charing Cross, Milton had with him there his wife, their two infant girls, Anne and Mary, and his younger nephew. Of the mother-in-law, Mrs. Powell, nothing precise is heard at the moment; but she and her children appear to have been domiciled in a poor way somewhere in Westminster. Neither do we hear anything precise at this time of Milton's brother, Christopher. He was probably in London with his family, living as a Royalist lawyer in small practice and still in difficulties about his composition-suit. It may have been one of Milton's troubles in his Secretaryship that these Royalist relatives of his expected impossible things in their favour from his new interest with the ruling powers. There is reason to think that his sister, Mrs. Agar, and her husband, were still in London, and in good circumstances, whatever had befallen Mr. Agar's situation in the Crown office; and, if so, one sees no reason why young Phillips, Mrs. Agar's son by her former husband, should not have been a good deal with *them.* His uncle had not now leisure for teaching him, and the lad must have been rather in the way in the apartments at Thomson's.[1]

Quartered at Charing Cross, and going daily to the Council-room, first at Derby House, and then in Whitehall, in the midst of all the political stir of Westminster, Milton was necessarily more in public society than had hitherto been his habit. Through his official position itself he must have formed many new acquaintanceships, and some interesting friendships. Not one of the Councillors in constant attendance but must have had a daily word or two with the Latin Secretary; and among those who became more intimate with him, in addition to President Bradshaw, we have reason for including Cromwell, Fairfax, Vane, Whitlocke, Pickering, and Alderman Pennington. As Cromwell was bound for Ireland, there was to be an interruption for some time of any personal intercourse with *him;* but, save for the week or so spent in the pursuit and suppression of the Army-Levellers, Cromwell had hardly missed a Council-meeting through the first three months of Milton's familiarity with the Council-room. Nor, if he had read nothing of Milton's before, can he have avoided reading or looking into the *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates,* the first public justification as that was of the actions in which he had been chief, or the *Observations on Ormond's Peace with the Irish,* which appertained to the business now peculiarly his, and in which there was that splendid compliment to himself in reply to Ormond's insult. He might hope to see more of Milton in time coming. Meanwhile, for lesser acquaintances, not of the Council itself, Milton had the two Frosts, and perhaps a score of other persons who were in the habit of coming about Council business. Of the two favourite Chaplains, Thomas Goodwin and John Owen, the younger and more interesting, yet to be known among Independent Divines as the great Mr. Owen, had been appointed to go with Cromwell; but Goodwin was to remain, with Peter Sterry and others, to assist him in chaplain's duty. Hugh Peters does not seem to have been so much in request now as preacher, though the Council remembered his services, and were anxious to give him suitable employment; and Mr. John Goodwin, though very acceptable to his own congregation in Coleman Street, and a strong partisan of the Commonwealth, was too heterodox in the Arminian or Socinian direction to please most of the Councillors so well as his namesake Thomas. Of the two Goodwins, however, Milton must, I fancy, have preferred John, the eminent Tolerationist reasoner. Had not the London Presbyterian ministers conjoined him and Milton most conspicuously more than a year before in their enumeration of notable heretics? and had he not, like Milton, courageously defied them?[1] More recently, in his Ὑβριστοδίκαι: *The Obstructors of Justice or A Defence of the Sentence upon the King*, published May 30, had he not followed Milton's *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, and cited that Treatise with much respect? That he and Milton now met pretty frequently is beyond a doubt. Then, of the non-clerical, or but semi-clerical, sort of scholars and speculative men, there was Milton's old friend, Samuel Hartlib, still extant and busy as ever, with Hartlib's fellow-countryman, Mr. Theodore Haak, the founder of the London Club or Invisible College of Natural Philosophers. They had been speaking more than once in Parliament of a provision of £100 a year for each of these Germans; and indeed all such ingenious and free-minded men, native or foreign, were in favour with the Commonwealth authorities and welcome at the public offices.[1]

---

[1] Phillips's Life of Milton (1694), p. xxxiii. (where Phillips first carelessly connects Milton's temporary residence at Thomson's with an event which did not happen till 1652, but then fortunately furnishes means for checking his blunder and fixing the date exactly); Wood's Ath. IV. 760; Godwin's Lives of the Phillipses; Hamilton's *Milton Papers,* p. 78 et seq.

---

[1] See Vol. III. pp. 676—680.

And so, morning after morning, in the early half of the year 1649, sometimes in the company of one or other of the men that have just been mentioned, Milton was to be seen in the neighbourhood of Charing Cross, walking between Whitehall and Spring Gardens. The old Cross had been demolished and removed in 1647, and the Londoners were still regretting it, and pretending that its absence perplexed them.

> "At the end of the Strand they make a stand,
> Swearing they are at a loss;
> And chafing say, 'This is not the way:
> We must go by Charing Cross.'"

The fine statue of Charles I., as all the world knows, is there now to make amends; but it had not been set up at the time of which we speak. It was another *Eikon Basilike* that Milton had in his mind, morning after morning, as he passed that spot.[2]

---

[1] Council Order Books at various places; Commons Journals May 2 and June 8, 1649; the Thomason copy of Goodwin's ʽΥβριστοδίκαι ("Printed for "Henry Cripps and Lodowick Lloyd: "and are to be sold in Pope's Head "Alley: 1649.").

[2] Cunningham's London, p. 105; Percy's Reliques (The Ballad of the Downfall of Charing Cross).

BOOK II.

JULY 1649—APRIL 1653.

HISTORY :—ANNALS OF THE COMMONWEALTH :—

- FIRST YEAR OF THE COMMONWEALTH CONTINUED : JULY 10, 1649—FEB. 18, 1649–50.
- SECOND YEAR OF THE COMMONWEALTH : FEB. 18, 1649–50 —FEB. 18, 1650–51.
- THIRD YEAR OF THE COMMONWEALTH ; FEB. 18, 1650–51 —DEC. 1, 1651.
- FOURTH YEAR OF THE COMMONWEALTH, AND FRAGMENT OF A FIFTH : DEC. 1, 1651—APRIL 20, 1653.

BIOGRAPHY :—MILTON'S LIFE THROUGH THE PERIOD OF THE COMMONWEALTH, WITH HIS SECRETARYSHIP UNDER FIVE SUCCESSIVE COUNCILS OF STATE.

CHAPTER I.

ANNALS OF THE COMMONWEALTH: FIRST YEAR CONTINUED, JULY 10, 1649—FEB. 18, 1649–50.

CROMWELL'S VICTORIES IN IRELAND: ACTIVITY OF THE PARLIAMENT AND COUNCIL OF STATE AT HOME: ROYALIST AND LEVELLING PAMPHLETS: BRADSHAW'S NEW PRESS ACT: TRIAL OF LILBURNE AND HIS FELLOW-LEVELLERS: THEIR ACQUITTAL: CASE OF CLEMENT WALKER: CONTINUED DISAFFECTION OF THE PRESBYTERIANS: ENDEAVOURS TO HUMOUR THEM: *THE ENGAGEMENT*: STATE OF FOREIGN RELATIONS: MISSIONS TO SPAIN, PORTUGAL, AND HAMBURG: ELECTION OF NEW COUNCIL OF STATE: DEATH OF THE EARL OF PEMBROKE.

THE great theme of these seven months was Cromwell's campaign in Ireland. The merest summary of the events of that campaign will be enough here.

Cromwell did not arrive in Ireland till August 15. Things there were then at their worst. But for assistance opportunely rendered to Jones, Monk, and Coote, by the able Roman Catholic malcontent, Owen Roe O'Neile, on terms which the Parliament afterwards repudiated (blaming Monk in particular for having negotiated with such a rebel, but accepting Monk's quaint apology that he had done it "on his own score"), Ormond might by this time have been in possession of Ireland altogether. As it was, he had driven Monk out of the country, and left to the Commonwealth only Dublin, commanded by Jones, and Londonderry, held by Coote against the Ulster Scots. Jones, before Cromwell's arrival, but when already in communication with him, had repulsed Ormond from before Dublin, and so saved the capital (Aug. 2). It was accounted a gallant service; and, though Ireton had come as second in command, the arrangement was modified in Jones's honour, so that, when Cromwell began his Lord-Lieutenancy, it was with Jones as his Lieutenant-General and Ireton as Major-General.[1]

The storming of Drogheda (September 10) was Cromwell's first great action, and the announcement also of that tremendous policy of "no quarter" which he had resolved, in the name of ultimate mercy itself, to apply to Ireland. As the news of the slaughter at Drogheda spread, the rest of Ireland was appalled. At once Trim and Dundalk were abandoned by their garrisons and occupied by the English. Arklow, Fernes, and Inniscorthy followed, as soon as Cromwell marched south; and at Wexford, which did resist and had to be taken, there was a repetition of the dreadful lesson of Cromwell's new method with the eight years' rebellion (October 11). The garrison of Ross then saved itself by surrender (October 19); and the last main act of Cromwell himself in that year's campaign was the drawn siege of Waterford (November 24—December 1). In three months he had substantially recovered the whole Province of Leinster. Meanwhile, in the Provinces of Ulster and Munster, by the activity of his lieutenants and subordinates, there had been much corresponding success. In Ulster, the reduction of Newry, Dromore, Lisburne, and Belfast, by Colonel Venables, had ensured the east coast of the Province, in addition to Londonderry, held by Coote in the north (September). In Munster the chief agent for Cromwell had been Lord Broghill, of the great Anglo-Irish family of the Boyles. This nobleman, for the last two years a Royalist, had been recently won over to the Commonwealth and to Cromwell's close friendship, in an interview of mingled persuasion and threats, which Cromwell had held with him in London, as he was on the point of embarking secretly to join Charles II. in Holland. He had come to Ireland in October; Munster, where his family estates and connexions lay, had been assigned to his charge; and he had in a few weeks obtained possession of Cork, Youghal, Bandon Bridge, and Kinsale. Cromwell, whose march to Waterford had brought him to the borders of that Province, then joined Broghill there; and it was with his head-quarters chiefly at Cork that he spent the months of December 1649 and January 1649–50, giving his troops a rest, and preparing for farther action. Vast as had been his success, his work in Ireland was not yet over. Ormond and his generals, though they had been unable, with the mixed and mutually discordant materials at their command, to make any stand against Cromwell, were still in the field; Kilkenny was still the centre of the Roman Catholic Confederacy; and the repudiation by the English Parliament of Monk's treaty with Owen Roe O'Neile had put an end to the division in the Confederacy represented by that malcontent, and had added O'Neile's forces to those of Ormond. A great convention of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy had been held for the reconciliation of all internal differences, the union of all parties and forces whatsoever against Cromwell, and the proclamation of the fact in a public manifesto (December 4). One cause of regret the Confederacy had in this hour of their apparently unanimous reunion. Their ablest man, Owen Roe O'Neile, had died in the very crisis, cut off suddenly by ulcer in the foot. At the very same time, the other side lost one of its best men, by the death of Cromwell's second in command, Lieutenant-General Michael Jones. He died of a chance fever, caught immediately after the siege of Waterford, and while the Parliament at home were voting him lands and honours. The brave Welshman, Presbyterian or Presbyteriano-Independent in religion, and the Old Irish and Ultra-Catholic O'Neile, had passed away together.[1]

---

[1] Carlyle's Cromwell, II. 35—47; Godwin, III. 140—147; Commons Journals, Aug. 10. In Clement Walker's *History of Independency,* Part II. 225—242, there is a great deal of Royalist gossip about Cromwell's going to Ireland, and Monk's Treaty with O'Neile.

At home, all this while, much of the interest had consisted in the reception, at intervals, of the glorious news from

---

[1] Carlyle's Cromwell, II. 43—103; Godwin, III. 147—158; with references to the Commons Journals.

Ireland. For the rest, the Government of England was carried on by the Council of State and the Parliament, without Cromwell. The attendance in the Council through this period rarely exceeded *twelve* members, and sometimes sank to the bare quorum of *nine*. In Parliament the division records through the same period show, for the first five months of the seven, or till Nov. 27, a minimum attendance of 35 and a maximum of exactly 50. On that date, however, there was a house of 67; and the tendency to increase continued, till, in January and February 1649–50, there were houses of 73, 74, 80, 85, and 86. Cromwell's Irish victories, creating new confidence in the Commonwealth, had evidently by that time lured back absentees more effectually than the facilities for their return which the House had already afforded. At least two new members came into the House by election. One was Mr. Carew Raleigh, the only surviving son of the great Raleigh, recently gentleman of the Privy Chamber to Charles I., now about forty-five years of age, and with some reputation for literary ability on account of sonnets and songs in private circulation. He took his seat, on the 17th of July, for Haslemere in Surrey. The Earl of Salisbury took his for Lyme Regis, on the 18th of September.[1]

Two very compact bodies, it must be allowed; but they grasped a world of business. In the MS. Order Books of the Council of State for the period, and in the printed Journals of the Commons, what a mass of considering, debating, and deciding, meets one, and over what a miscellany of topics! Communications with Cromwell, and constant care for supplies to him, in the first place; but how much besides! Private Bills and Public Bills; first, second, and third readings of each; Committees of the whole House on each, with adjournments and amendments; Resolutions pointing to new Bills; Committees of the House for this or that purpose of some Resolution, and for the preparation of the new Bills indicated; Acts abortive, and Acts finally passed (all after Oct. 12 under the express new title of "Acts of Parliament");

---

[1] Council Order Books and Commons Journals of the stated period and for given dates; Wood's Ath. II. 244.

the Acts and Resolutions ranging over every possible subject, from the Propagation of the Gospel to the Customs on Sugar, Silks, Pepper, and Tobacco, and the protection of the home-trade in Hat-bands: such is the amazing medley. Always one sees Parliament in front and facing the public, but always the Council of State at the back, managing through manuscript and by reports and recommendations conveyed to the House. As before, we must keep to the main lines.

Home-disaffection was still rife, both on the side of the Royalists and on that of the Levellers.

By a sure instinct, Cromwell, often now called "King Oliver," was regarded by all the ROYALISTS as the incarnation of the detested Commonwealth; and every attack on the Commonwealth, through their weekly news-pamphlets, was directed at him. Thus, in rigmarole verse, in one of these pamphlets, immediately after his departure for Ireland, by way of epitaph on him if he should be fortunately killed in the wars:—

"Here lies (the Devil take his soul!)
One for whom no bell would toll.
He lived a murderer, died a knave;
Deserved a halter, not a grave."

When, after a month or two, the false news came from Ireland that Cromwell had been, if not killed, at least grievously wounded, this was the corresponding doggrel:—

"Two maimed men now there are to draw
  The Juncto into Hell,
For judging Charles without the law:
  Skippon and Cromwell."[1]

Equally virulent, though with the important difference that they regarded Cromwell as the incarnation of the *imperfection* of the Commonwealth, were the LEVELLING pamphleteers. "*Picture of the Council of State*" (April 11); "*A Manifestation from John Lilburne, Mr. William Walwyn,*" &c. (April 16); "*The Army's Martyr: or a Relation of the Barbarous Proceedings of the Court-Martial at the Whitehall upon Mr. Lockyer*" (April 30); "*The Agreement of the Free People of*

---

[1] *A new Bull Baiting,* (Aug. 7, 1649); and *The Man in the Moon,* No. 28 (for Oct. 31—Nov. 7, 1649).

England: by Lieut.-Col. Lilburne" (May 1); "*The Legal Fundamental Liberties of the People of England: by Lieut.-Col. John Lilburne*" (June 18: second edition Aug. 4); "*The Impeachment of High Treason against Oliver Cromwell and his Son-in-law, Henry Ireton, Esq.: by Lieut.-Col. John Lilburne*" (Aug. 10); "*The English Tyrants: or a Brief History of the Lives and Actions of the High and Mighty States, the Lords of Westminster*" (Aug. 14); "*The Levellers, falsely so called, Vindicated*" (Aug. 21): such are the titles of a few of the pamphlets with which Lilburne and his three fellow-prisoners, from their wonderfully easy captivity in the Tower, or associates of theirs outside, maintained the doctrine of *New Chains,* and still stirred the Levellers. At the centre of this opposition to the Commonwealth was always Lilburne, defining himself in print openly thus: "JOHN LILBURNE, that "never yet changed his principles from better to worse, nor "could ever be threatened out of them, nor courted from them, "that never feared the rich nor mighty, nor never despised "the poor nor needy, but always hath, and hopes by God's "goodness to continue, *semper idem.*"[1]

No wonder that both the Council of State and the House continued to be uneasy about the licentiousness of the Press. The Act on the subject which Bradshaw had been instructed to prepare, and which the Council had matured, was read the first and second times in the House on the 9th of August, and became law on the 20th of September; from which date it was to be in force for two years. This Act is somewhat remarkable in the History of the English Press. At first sight it seems severe enough. Printing-presses were to be allowed only in London, Oxford, Cambridge, and York; for books from abroad London was to be the only port; and all such imported books were to be viewed and passed by the Master and Wardens of the Stationers' Company. The author of every seditious libel or pamphlet was to be fined £10 or imprisoned for forty days; for the printer the fine was to be £5, with the loss of his printing-press, and for the bookseller, £2; even the buyer of a scandalous pamphlet was to pay twenty shillings, if he did not give it up to a Justice of Peace. The Act then proceeds: "And for the prevention "of false, imperfect, and impertinent relations of Parlia- "mentary proceedings, and other such occurrences and news, ". . . be it enacted . . . that no person whatsoever shall "compose, write, print, publish, sell or utter, or cause to be "made, written, printed, or uttered, any Book or Pamphlet, "Treatise, Sheet or Sheets of news whatsoever, *unless licensed* "*as is hereafter mentioned,* upon the like penalty," &c. The reference in the words "hereafter mentioned" is to a subsequent paragraph of the Act, which says: "Be it further "enacted that all former licenses granted by authority of "both or either House of Parliament to any person or "persons for printing any Diurnal, News, or Occurrences, "shall be from henceforth void and of no further effect, and "that no Book, Pamphlet, Sheet or Sheets of news or occur- "rences whatsoever shall henceforth be printed, bound, "stitched, or put to sale by any person or persons whatsoever, "unless the same be first approved of and licensed under "the hand of the Clerk of the Parliament, or of such person "as shall be authorized by the Council of State for the time "being, or (for so much as may concern the affairs of the "Army) under the hand of the Secretary of the Army for the "time being, the same to be entered in their several Registers, "to be by them kept for that purpose, and also in the "Register-Book of the Company of Stationers, according to "ancient custom." Printers in London were to enter into bond of £300 not to print "any seditious, scandalous, or "treasonable pamphlet, paper, book, or picture," and also not to print "*any pamphlet, paper, or book of news, not licensed as* "*aforesaid,*" and also to insert in the title-page of every book pamphlet, paper, or picture, "the Author's name, with his "quality and place of residence, *or at least the Licensers' names* "*where licenses are required,*" besides their own names and addresses. "And, whereas divers vagrant persons, of idle "conversations, having forsaken their usual callings, and

---

[1] The Thomason Collection of Pamphlets, with their MS. datings. Lilburne's signature is from his *Picture of the Council of State,* dated from the Tower April 3, 1649, and published April 11.

"accustomed themselves after the manner of hawkers to sell "and cry about the streets, and in other places, pamphlets "and other books, and under colour thereof are found to "disperse all sorts of dangerous libels, to the intolerable dis-"honour of the Parliament and the whole Government of this "Commonwealth, be it ordained and enacted . . . that no "such hawkers shall be any more permitted, and that they "and all ballad-singers, wherever they are or may be appre-"hended, shall forfeit all books, pamphlets, ballads, and papers, "by them exposed to sale, and shall, by such as shall by "virtue of this Act seize upon them, be conveyed and carried "to the House of Correction, there to be whipped as common "rogues and then dismissed." These regulations, we repeat, are certainly severe enough; and yet, when they are studied, they present one remarkable, though quite tacit, improvement upon the famous Ordinance for Printing of June 1643, which Milton had assailed in his *Areopagitica,* but which had remained unrepealed. That Ordinance (Vol. III. pp. 269–270) had trusted mainly to the system of Censorship or Official Licensing before Printing; but, though this Act recognises and continues that system in a general way, it is clear from the whole tenor, and especially from the phrases we have put in Italics, that it contemplated the rigid application of the Licensing System thenceforth only to one class of publications, viz. Newspapers and Political Pamphlets, leaving the licensing of books at large much more a matter of option. This construction, we shall find, was put upon the Act at the time, though not so decidedly but that respectable publishers still thought it safer to have their best books licensed, and the Rev. Messrs. Downham, Caryl, and Gataker, with Sir Nathaniel Brent, and others of the Licensers appointed under the Ordinance of 1643, still did something for their salaries. Meanwhile it is interesting to observe even the partial adoption, though in such a merely tacit way, of the principle of the *Areopagitica* in the new Act, and to connect the fact with Milton's secretaryship to the Council.[1]

The case of John Lilburne, the arch-chief of the Levellers, continued, of course, to be supreme in the public mind. Indeed it rose in interest by passing through extraordinary new phases. There is ample evidence that the Government, notwithstanding Cromwell's advice that there was "no way to deal with such men but to break them to pieces," would willingly have dropped the particular prosecution of Lilburne, Overton, Walwyn, and Prince, threatened since March last on account of *New Chains*, and rendered easier by the revised Treasons Act which had been passed in the interim. They had taken no notice of the exasperating pamphlets, outdoing even *New Chains* in ferocity,[1] which the prisoners had issued or contrived from their captivity, nor yet of certain threatening letters which Lilburne had addressed to the Council of State through one of its members. On the 18th of July they had even given Lilburne temporary liberty, on account of the death of one of his children and illness in the rest of his family; and on the 7th of September they relaxed the imprisonment of all four in the Tower, evidently with a view to their total release. In fact, there were negotiations at this time between Government and the London chiefs of the Levellers, on the chance of keeping them quiet. That proved to be impossible. Mere pamphlets of invective having failed, Lilburne had availed himself of his temporary liberty to tamper with the Army. In *An Outcry of the Young Men and Apprentices of London* (Aug. 29), signed by ten apprentices, but really Lilburne's, and addressed directly to the private soldiers of the Army, he had called upon them to disown Fairfax and Cromwell, treat the Parliament and Council of State as "tyrants and usurpers," and re-establish the Army-Agitatorships. New mutinies in some regiments, at Oxford and elsewhere, coinciding with this appeal, and proof having been obtained of actual intercourse between the Levellers and emissaries of Charles II., and Lilburne himself having hinted in his Address to the Army that a "regulated Kingship" might be enough, the Government had then no choice. On the 11th of September his *Outcry* was condemned in Parliament; and on the 19th Lilburne, again under arrest, was re-committed to the Tower, to be tried alone, for that and previous offences, by a special court under the new Treasons Act. London was much excited in his behalf, and petitions in his favour were sent in by the citizens; but with no effect. Lilburne seems then to have been really in some alarm. In a paper, of date Oct. 22, entitled *The Innocent Man's Second Proffer* (a sequel to a *First Proffer*) he undertook, on certain conditions, to relieve the Government of all farther trouble from him by emigrating to America. The offer was received in silence, and the Trial came on at Guildhall. It lasted two days (Oct. 25–26). Lilburne was himself again on the occasion, and spoke, and argued points of law, and fought his case inch by inch with Keble and the other Judges, in a manner thought marvellous. His brother, Colonel Robert Lilburne, a faithful Commonwealth's officer, stood at the bar with him in a most brotherly way. The Judges did their best for a conviction, but the jury were favourable; and, amid such shoutings of joy as had never before rung in Guildhall, John was unanimously acquitted. Bonfires blazed in London all that night, and the transport lasted several days. The Government felt themselves foiled, and for about a fortnight there were hesitations; but, persuaded at last by Henry Marten, Lord Grey of Groby, and others, who had retained a kindly feeling for John throughout, they succumbed to the inevitable. Accordingly, on the 8th of November, Lilburne, Overton, Walwyn, and Prince, were discharged from the Tower by Council of State warrants, signed by Bradshaw. *Truth's Victory over Tyrants* was Lilburne's printed exultation over the affair as soon as he came out.[1]

---

[1] Scobell's Acts and Ordinances, II. 88—93.

---

[1] *The Impeachment against Cromwell and Ireton* (published August 10, but dated by Lilburne from the Tower, "17 July") is almost mad with ferocity, and hideously vulgar to boot. On the title-page it is stated that the purpose is "to prove Oliver Cromwell guilty of the highest treason that was ever acted in England, and more deserving punishment and death than the forty-four judges hanged for injustice by King Alfred"; and in the pamphlet itself Cromwell and Ireton are called "lying base hypocrites," and so "abominably vile that . . ." (the rest unquotable). Bradshaw is called "the hired mercenary slave" of the two.

[1] Council Order Books and Commons Journals of several dates; Walker's History of Independency, Part II. p. 247 (giving date of the *Outcry*); Godwin, III. 163—177; Bisset's *Omitted Chapters of the History of England* (1864), pp. 191—251. Mr. Bisset relates Lilburne's Trial at length, with copious extracts, and makes John more of a hero than Godwin does, though Godwin is not unfavourable. On the whole, I like him myself, and am glad he is in the History of England, but think he was an ass.

Before Lilburne was released, the Government were busy with another culprit, equally distinguishable from the ordinary pamphleteers, but far less popular. This was Clement Walker, Esq., formerly a recruiting member of Parliament for Wells, but, since his ejection by Pride's Purge, one of the most venomous foes of the Commonwealth. *The History of Independency, with the Rise, Growth, and Practices of that Powerful and Restless Faction,* had been the title of a book of his, in 192 pages, brought out in the end of 1648, under the pseudonym of "Theophilus Verax," with a dedication "To my Dread Sovereign," and consisting of rambling comments on the proceedings of the Long Parliament to that date, sprinkled with odd anecdotes, and made lively by sarcasms and personalities. That book had sunk out of sight when, in August or September 1649, there appeared, under the slightly altered pseudonym of "Theodorus Verax," a sequel, in 256 pages, entitled, *Anarchia Anglicana: or, The History of Independency, the Second Part; being a Continuation of Relations and Observations Historical and Politique upon this present Parliament.* It consisted of an account of the King's Trial, a denunciation of the Regicides (the names of all the King's Judges being printed in red ink, for blood), and a fierce review of the proceedings of the Commonwealth, with defences of the Levellers, and protests in behalf of Charles II. Such a book could not be overlooked. On the 24th of October Parliament issued orders for the arrest of Mr. Walker and the seizure of his papers; and on the 13th of November he was committed to the Tower to wait his trial for High Treason.[1]

It was easy to arrest prominent enemies, like Lilburne and Clement Walker, or printers and booksellers guilty of the minor offence of vending their seditious writings. How to reach and influence the vast diffused mass of Royalist sentiment throughout the community, more especially in its respectable and dogmatic Presbyterian form, was the real difficulty. The *Eikon Basilike* had taken possession of the

---

[1] Original Editions of Walker's *Hist. of Independency*; Catalogue of the Thomason Pamphlets; Commons Journals of dates last given.

Presbyterian soul, no less than of the soul of the suppressed Anglicans; and the Presbyterians were able to speak out for Charles II., and against the Commonwealth, in ways, both direct and indirect, which defied indictment. The clergy of London, in their Provincial Synods (the sixth of which met in November 1649, with Mr. George Walker for Moderator), could frame proofs of the divine right of Presbyterial Government, and of the sinfulness of schism and its toleration; the Provincial Synod of Lancashire could do the like; and all over the country Presbyterian ministers could keep alive the topic of the violation of the Covenant by the change of Government. What was more ominous, there could be, and there were, communications between the English Presbyterians and the Scottish Kingdom and Kirk, where the banner of Charles II. had been already raised. From the General Assembly of the Kirk, for example, held at Edinburgh in July and August 1649, there came a "Brotherly Exhortation to their Brethren in England," in which, after much about the breach of the Covenant by the Sectaries who held rule in England, and "the strange and unexpected practices" of many there besides, there were such sentences as these: "Amidst these fears and griefs, it is unto us "matter of rejoicing that there be many in England who "mourn for all these abominations;" "Christ's right to these "kingdoms is surer than that he should be pleaded out of it "by a pretended Liberty of Conscience, and his begun posses-"sion is more precious to him than to be satisfied with a "dishonourable Toleration." How obviously verbose and canting had Scottish documents now become![1]

At first the Government had been disposed to measures of repression, or even of retaliation, on the Presbyterians. As early as March, we have seen, a Presbyterian minister, Mr. Thomas Cawton, had been arrested for treasonable speeches in the pulpit, and an order had passed for an Act prohibiting ministers from discussing State affairs in their sermons. To the same effect, in April, had been an Act discontinuing the Monthly Fasts which had hitherto been held by authority, and which were abused by the preachers for their political discourses. Even in August Parliament was in the same mood. On the 6th of that month a Committee was appointed to inquire whether an impression of the Westminster Assembly's *Confession of Faith*, which had been brought out by a bookseller, named Bostock, with a licence by Mr. Cranford, had been validly licensed; on the 8th there were votes pointing to an intention of reviewing the Acts establishing Presbytery; and on the 14th notice was taken of a London issue of the Brotherly Exhortation to the English from the Scottish Kirk. Thenceforward, however, the tendency seemed to be, as far as possible, to friendly remonstrance and measures of conciliation. On the same 14th of August, for example, Mr. Cawton was released. Then, on the 28th of September, there was issued a new and elaborate *Declaration of the Parliament in Vindication of their Proceedings*, which, though addressed to the whole nation, was substantially an appeal to the Presbyterians, and a reasoning with their prejudices. It seems to have been drawn up chiefly by Mr. Scott, who reported it from the Council of State, and it is rather a mean document; but it is full of assurances of the zeal of Parliament for pure Religion and morality, and their perfect friendliness to the Presbyterian establishment as already set up; and it tries to argue the great matter of dispute—i.e. the avowed Toleration policy of the new Government in respect to other denominations—in the mildest and most inoffensive manner. Various Acts and Votes, following this *Vindication*, were evidently meant to make good its words. On the 28th of November the Benchers of the Inns of Court were instructed to prevent gaming and revelry in these places; on the 20th of December a Committee was named for considering how the Gospel might be preached over the whole nation; on the 29th of January 1649–50 it was ordered that an Act on this subject should be brought in, and that the House should attend specially to the subject every Friday; and there were similar Votes as to the Propagation of the Gospel and Encouragement of Learning in Ireland. In an interview with the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Common Council of London (December 4) the anxiety of the Corporation on the subject of the prevalence of Sabbath-breaking, Swearing, Drunkenness, &c., was reciprocated by the House; and on the 1st of February a blasphemous book, called *A Flying Fiery Roll,* was ordered to be burnt by the hangman.[1]

---

[1] Neal, III. 13—14; Acts of General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland in 1649.

The most famous device, however, for securing the allegiance of the Presbyterians, and of all others, to the Commonwealth, was the so-called ENGAGEMENT. This is not to be confounded with the quite contrary Scottish Engagement of the preceding year. It was simply a promise of allegiance to the Commonwealth in these words: "I do declare and "promise that I will be true and faithful to the Common-"wealth of England, as the same is established, without "a King or a House of Lords." First invented by the Parliament (October 11) as a test for its own members, the obligation of the promise was extended immediately (October 12) to all the officers and men in the Army and Navy, all Judges and Lawyers, all members of civic Corporations, all Sheriffs and County Officials of every kind, all Heads of Colleges and Fellows and Graduates in the Universities, all Schoolmasters and Scholars, all Ministers who were members of the Westminster Assembly or otherwise in connexion with Government, and all Governors and Officials of the English Colonies. By a subsequent Act (January 2, 1649–50) subscription to the Engagement was required universally; and from that date the Commonwealth had this short and simple protective test of its own, not positively repealing, but practically superseding, the ambiguous and obsolete Solemn League and Covenant.[2]

What, meanwhile, of the relations of the Commonwealth with Foreign Powers? For a time they may be described as *nil.* There was no war between the Commonwealth and any Foreign State, and ships seem to have passed and repassed freely enough, the English navies under Blake, Dean, and

---

[1] Commons Journals of dates given; Council Order Book, Sept. 26; Parl. Hist. III. 1319—1334 (the Vindication at length).

[2] Commons Journals of dates given.

Popham, compelling to at least that civility; but all the Foreign Powers still looked askance on the King-killing Island. Charles II., it is true, had been bowed out of the Hague after the murder of Dorislaus, and, after some stay with his mother in France, during which there was much coldness and difference between them, had gone to reside in Jersey, then still out of the bounds of the Commonwealth. Thence, when Cromwell's victories in Ireland had rendered his projected landing there impossible, and a renewed bargain with the Scots for an initiative in Scotland had become his only alternative, he removed to Breda in North Brabant, where the Prince of Orange had family property, and could give him an asylum on his own account. Negotiations, however, for distinct diplomatic intercourse between England and the United Provinces had made little progress, the States-General resisting the proposal to admit the English Resident, Mr. Strickland, to a public audience, though the Provincial States of Holland urged it. Nor had Mr. Isaac Lee at Hamburg had much more success. Not till the end of 1649 were there symptoms that any of the Foreign Powers would be accessible to envoys from the Commonwealth. Apparently, Cromwell's Irish victories had brought about the change. Spain, still nominally the great Catholic Power in Europe, had not been regarding the events in Ireland with indifference; Hyde and Cottington were now at Madrid, negotiating for Charles II.; what if, as the old Irish or Sacerdotal Party were speculating, his Spanish majesty, for Charles II. or independently, should assume the Protectorship of oppressed Ireland? Neither was Portugal quite out of the question. Prince Rupert, escaping from Ireland with the ships he had taken thither to cooperate with Ormond, had gone at once to the Portuguese coast, where English merchantmen were not scarce, and where, unless the Portuguese preserved neutrality, much damage might therefore follow. Finally, the Irish, in their despair, had been talking of throwing aside Charles II. altogether, and inviting the Roman Catholic Duke of Lorraine to be their sovereign. In these circumstances the Council of State resolved on an attempt to establish diplomatic intercourse with at least three of the European Powers. To Spain they thought of sending two envoys, one to be Resident at Madrid, and the other to be Consul in Andalusia; but there was great difficulty in finding persons willing to accept such posts. Under date January 2, 1649–50, the Order Books do indeed show this entry: "That Mr. Peters shall be Consul in Andalusia, and "that he shall have also credentials to the King of Spain, "and instructions about the business of the Fleet that is "going southwards, and that Mr. Peters be summoned to be "at the Committee that is appointed for this business to-"morrow morning." If this was Hugh Peters, his mission to Spain would have been a historical curiosity. But it was not to happen. "That the Vote formerly made concerning "Mr. Peters his being consul in Andalusia be vacated," is a minute of January 4. In short, the proposal of the Andalusian consulship was dropped, and, the Council of State having considered matters more maturely, and having at length found persons both willing and suitable, it was resolved by the House, on the 31st of January, 1649–50, to send MR. ANTHONY ASCHAM as Resident to Madrid, MR. CHARLES VANE as Agent to Portugal, and MR. RICHARD BRADSHAW as Agent to Hamburg. Vane was a younger brother of Sir Henry Vane, and Bradshaw was probably some relation of President Bradshaw. Each of the three envoys was to have a salary of £800 a year.[1]

When these appointments were made the First Year of the Commonwealth was drawing to a close. Was there to be any modification of the existing Constitution at that natural period, any dissolution yet of the existing Parliament? The question had been discussed, but not till the last moment. On the 9th of January Sir Henry Vane, for the Committee for considering the succession of Parliaments, reported to the House a Draft Reform Bill for the election of a new Representative House of about 400 members, in proportions among the counties not unlike those in Ireton's Draft Bill, though not quite the same. There were general Resolutions on the subject that day, and the House resumed the subject in Committee on five following days; but on the whole with the practical conclusion that the infant Moses must still be nursed by his own mother. The business of nominating the New Council of State, therefore, occupied February 12, 1649–50, and one or two succeeding days. Thirty-seven of the former 41 were reelected, and five new members were chosen, making the number of the New Council 42. The five new Councillors were chosen, by a mixed system of ballot and open vote, in a House of 108 members, each member present first giving in an unsigned paper with the names of the five he voted for, and then the whole House accepting or rejecting successively those placed at the top of the poll. The three at the top were appointed unanimously; but the next two were set aside, and the two next to them in the ballot substituted.[1]

---

[1] Clarendon, 725 et seq.; Godwin, III. 356—357; Council Order Book as cited; Commons Journals, Jan. 1649—50. See also Mrs. Green's Calendar of State Papers (Domestic Series) for 1649—50, Preface, xxxv—xliii., with references there to documents. Vane's salary was to be £600 a year, with a guarantee of an additional £200 of "consulage."

One member of the Old Council, who would probably have been reappointed, had just died. This was Philip, Earl of Pembroke, one of the extreme Parliamentarian Peers since the beginning of the Civil War, and latterly one of the three Peers who had forsworn their order by taking seats in the single Representative House. He died January 23, 1649–50; and on the 6th of February the Council of State and the Parliament accompanied his corpse some way out of town on its way to Wilton. The Royalist pamphleteers exulted over his death, and this was the style of their epitaphs on him:—

> "He was a Judas, and Iscariot's fare
> He had; he lived in sin, died in despair;
> He was a new-made saint, and 's virtues were
> To curse, '*G——d——him!* '*sblood, and* '*swounds*' to swear:
> His name was Pembroke."

We may remember him more gently now as one of the two noble Herbert brothers (William, Earl of Pembroke, who died 1630, being the other and superior) to whom the first folio edition of Shakespeare's works had been dedicated in 1623, on the ground that they had "prosecuted both them and the author living with so much favour." He had in his youth known and liked Shakespeare.[1]

---

[1] Commons Journals of days named, and of Feb. 16, 19, and 20. Sir Henry Vane, senior, who was fourth on the ballot poll with 35 votes, was rejected in the open vote. The highest by the ballot had 60 votes, the next 59, the next 37. The rise of the attendance for this occasion to 108, by far the largest number since the constitution of the Commonwealth, is very significant.

---

[1] Council Order Book, Feb. 4, and Commons Journals of same day; *Mercurius Pragmaticus* for Jan. 22—29; and Heminge and Condell's Dedication of the first folio Shakespeare.

CHAPTER II.

MILTON'S LIFE AND SECRETARYSHIP FROM JULY 1649 TO FEB. 1649–50.

ENORMOUS POPULARITY OF THE *EIKON BASILIKE*: DOUBTS AS TO THE AUTHORSHIP: MILTON'S *EIKONOKLASTES*: ANALYSIS OF THE SAME, WITH QUOTATIONS: PARTICLES OF MILTON'S BIOGRAPHY FROM THE COUNCIL ORDER-BOOKS, WITH NOTICES OF MARCHAMONT NEEDHAM, CLEMENT WALKER, THE PRINTER NEWCOME, THE PRINTER ROYSTON, THE PRINTER DUGARD, AND OTHERS: MILTON'S REMOVAL FROM CHARING-CROSS TO AN OFFICIAL RESIDENCE IN WHITEHALL: HIS MISCELLANEOUS OFFICIAL OCCUPATIONS: FIVE OF HIS LATIN STATE LETTERS TO FOREIGN POWERS (NOS. I—V): SALMASIUS AND HIS *DEFENSIO REGIA*: ACCOUNT OF THE BOOK, WITH SPECIMENS: MILTON'S COMMISSION FROM THE COUNCIL OF STATE TO ANSWER THE BOOK.

First of all in this Chapter we may place the publication by Milton of that answer to the *Eikon Basilike* which he had been ordered or requested by the Council of State to write, and on which he must have been engaged, in his spare hours, for some months.

The *Eikon Basilike* having been out since the 9th of Feb. 1649, and having circulated in thousands of copies, in various sizes and forms,[1] there had been, besides the tears and enthusiasm over it among the Royalists, a good deal of shrewd discussion as to the real authorship. Was it the late King's at all, or only a forgery in his name, intended perhaps to have been brought out in his interest while he was alive, but afterwards converted into a funereal tribute to him and a plea for his dynasty? That such a controversy had arisen within the first month or two after the publication of the book is proved by a sentence in John Goodwin's *Obstructors of Justice opposed.* "As for the Book which passeth up "and down," says Goodwin, "by the title of Εἰκὼν Βασιλική, "which strains so many men's wits to invent, so many men's "consciences to exhibit, elegies of honour, admiration, astonish-"ment, commensurable with the seraphical worth of it, "whether *he* were the positive or only putative author of it, "though some make it their great interest, yet to me it is "a mere impertinency to determine." The question, however, was formally discussed by others. An anonymous pamphlet appeared on the 16th of August entitled Εἰκὼν Ἀληθινή: *The Portraiture of Truth's most sacred Majesty, truly suffering, but not solely; wherein the false colours are washed off wherewith the Paper-stainer had bedaubed Truth, the late King, and the Parliament, in his Counterfeit piece, entitled* Εἰκὼν Βασιλική: *published to undeceive the world.* Here the theory is that the *Eikon* was written by some English Prelate or Doctor, to ingratiate himself with the late King, but afterwards, on the King's death, published as likely to have a large sale; and the theory is suggested by an engraved frontispiece, representing the King at a desk writing, and a Doctor or Prelate dictating to him from behind a curtain. On the other hand the authenticity of the Book had already been maintained in a Royalist tract, published June 2, and called *The Princely Pelican: Royal Resolves, &c. Extracted from his Majesty's divine Meditations: with Satisfactory reasons to the whole King-*

---

[1] In an Article on the Eikon Basilike in Nichols's Lit. Anecdotes (I. 522—529) it is stated, on what seems excellent bibliographical authority, that there were fifty editions of the book in various languages within twelve months after the King's death, some of them with the Prayers and others without. I have two copies lying before me at the present moment, both bearing the date 1648, and therefore among the earliest printed, but quite different in size and appearance. One is in small octavo, in open and largish type, and with the words, "*Reprinted in R. M. An. Dom.* 1648," on the title-page; the other is an extremely

---

tiny little copy, with no such imprint on the title-page, but with a copy of the engraved frontispiece, and one or two other illustrations, bound up with it. This copy must have been the pocket copy of some devoted Royalist, for it had been bound in black velvet for mourning, and has a clasp and gilt edges. As if by long carrying in the pocket, the floss of the velvet is now nearly all worn off, and the diminutive little book looks like the faded model of a coffin.

dom that his sacred person was the only author of them ; and it was maintained afresh in a Tract, published Sept. 11, with the title Εἰκὼν ἡ πιστή, *or the Faithful Portraiture of a Loyal Subject, in vindication of* Εἰκὼν Βασιλική, *and in answer to a Book entitled* Εἰκὼν ᾿Αληθινή. On the whole, though a mystery hung over the Book, and some continued to be sceptics, and even to name Dr. Henry Hammond or a Dr. Harris as possibly the author, the doubters were publicly hushed, and the Royalists, at home and abroad, were left undisturbed in their admiration. How profound that was may be judged from one or two of the numberless contemporary references to the *Eikon.* "I "have delivered to your noble lady, for your Excellency," Sir Edward Nicholas had written from Caen to the Marquis of Ormond, in March 1648–9, "his late Majesty's *Portraiture,* "being the most exquisite, pious, and princely piece that I "ever read." And Hyde, writing from the Hague in April to Lord Hatton, then with the Queen-mother in France, and speaking of the obligation to serve the Queen laid upon him by his reverence for the memory of his dear master, if by nothing else, had added, with allusion to the affectionate mentions of the Queen made in the *Eikon*: "I verily believe "the immortal monument he hath left of his transcendent "affection to and value of her Majesty hath made that im-"pression on all men that whoever pretends to honour him "can never fail in duty to her; and I am persuaded the "Queen will live to reap a plentiful harvest from that seed." Again, "For all this their politic malice," Dr. Richard Watson had said, in a sermon preached before Charles II. at the Hague, "our Royal Martyr hath not only the crown and "trophy of a title, but the everlasting, stupendous monument "of a book, raised higher than the Pyramids of Egypt in the "strength of language and well-proportioned spiring expres-"sion." The Latin and French translations of the book, which Charles II. had ordered, had meanwhile appeared at the Hague—the former by Dr. John Earle, and entitled Εἰκὼν Βασιλική, *vel Imago Regis Caroli in illis suis Ærumnis et Solitudine;* and these were diffusing the admiration of the book among foreigners. But, for one all-comprehensive eulogy we may quote Clement Walker's celebrated *History of Independency*, *Part II*, published on or before Oct. 1649. "About this time," he says, referring to the date of the appearance of the *Eikon Basilike*, "a Phœnix arose out of "his Majesty's ashes, that most excellent issue of his brain "entitled *The Portraiture of his Sacred Majesty in his Solitudes* "*and Sufferings:* a book full fraught with wisdom, divine and "human, showing him to be more than conqueror of his "enemies in his rare Christian patience and charity. The "very reading of it aggravateth our loss of so gracious "and excellent a Prince, that had learnt the whole method "of human perfection in the school of adversity. Herod "and the Jews never persecuted Christ in his swaddling "clothes with more industrious malice than the Anti-mon-"archical Independent Faction this Book in the presses and "shops that should bring it forth into the world."[1]

It was into this state of opinion and feeling about the *Eikon Basilike* that Milton flung his answer to it on the 6th of Oct. 1649. It was a small quarto of 242 pages, with this title:—

"ΕΙΚΟΝΟΚΛΑ'ΣΤΗΣ in Answer To a Book Intitl'd Ε'ΙΚΩ'Ν ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ', The Portrature of his Sacred Majesty in his Solitudes and Sufferings. The Author I. M.

Prov. xxviii. 15, 16, 17.

15. As a roaring Lyon, and a ranging Beare, so is a wicked Ruler over the poor people.

16. The Prince that wanteth understanding, is also a great oppressor; but he that hateth covetousnesse shall prolong his dayes.

17. A man that doth violence to the blood of any person, shall fly to the pit, let no man stay him.

Salust. Conjurat. Catilin.

Regium imperium, quod initio, conservandæ libertatis, atque augendæ reipub. causâ fuerat, in superbiam, dominationemque se convertit.

---

[1] Goodwin's *Obstructors*, p. 96; Catalogue of Thomason Pamphlets for dates; Dr. Christopher Wordsworth's *Who wrote* Εἰκὼν Βασιλική? (1824) for description of the Εἰκὼν 'Αληθινή, and extracts from the letters of Nicholas and Hyde and Watson's Sermon; Walker's *Independency*, Part II. (edit. 1649) pp. 138—139.

Regibus boni, quam mali, suspectiores sunt; semperque his aliena virtus formidolosa est.

Quidlibet impunè facere, hoc scilicet regium est.

Published by Authority.

London, Printed by Matthew Simmons, next dore to the gilded Lyon in Aldersgate street. 1649."[1]

Eikonoklastes or *The Image-Breaker* is the title Milton had chosen for his book; and he gives the reason in his Preface. "In one thing," he there says, "I must commend his openness who gave the title to this book, *Eikon Basilike*, that is "to say *The King's Image*, and by the shrine he dresses out "for him certainly would have the people come and worship "him. For which reason this answer also is entitled *Eikonoklastes*, the famous surname of many Greek Emperors who, "in their zeal to the command of God, after long tradition of "idolatry in the Church, took courage and broke all superstitious Images to pieces." In the same Preface he explains that the honour in this particular case was not of his own seeking, but had been thrust upon him. "To descant," he says, "on the misfortunes of a person fallen from so high a "dignity, who hath also paid his final debt both to nature "and his faults, is neither of itself a thing commendable, "nor the intention of this discourse. Neither was it "fond ambition, or the vanity to get a name, present or "with posterity, by writing against a king: I never was "so thirsty after fame, nor so destitute of other hopes and "means, better and more certain, to attain it. . . . Nevertheless, for their sakes who, through custom, simplicity, or "want of better teaching, have not more seriously considered "kings than in the gaudy name of Majesty, and admire them "and their doings as if they breathed not the same breath with "other mortal men, I shall make no scruple to take up—for "it seems to be the challenge both of him and all his party—"to take up this gauntlet, though a king's, in the behalf of "Liberty and the Commonwealth." Besides, he proceeds, the *Eikon Basilike* was continuing to do for Charles's cause after his death what he had done by regal power while he was alive, and had been adopted by all his party as their standard, and therefore it might be the occasion of some useful refreshing of the public memory as to recent events. "For as to "any moment of solidity in the book itself, stuffed with "naught else but the common grounds of Tyranny and "Popery, sugared a little over, or any need of answering in "respect of staid and well-principled men, I take it on me as "a work assigned rather than by me chosen or affected. "Which was the cause both of beginning it so late and "finishing it so leisurely, in the midst of other employments "and diversions." This evidently means that, though the *Eikon* had been out since Feb. 9, Milton had had no thought of answering it till after his appointment to the Secretaryship in the end of March, when the Council suggested the task to him, and that since then his other duties had caused delay.

---

[1] In the copy of the first edition in the Thomason Collection the initials "J. M." are filled out in writing into "J. Milton," and the date "Oct^{r}. 6" is written on the title-page.

To some considerable extent Milton shared the suspicion that the *Eikon Basilike* was not really, or at least not wholly, by Charles. "As to the author of these Soliloquies," he says in the preface, "whether it were the late King, as is vulgarly "believed, or any secret coadjutor (and some stick not to "name him), it can add nothing, nor shall take from the "weight, if any be, of reason which he brings." So, in the body of the work, he speaks once of "the King or his house-"hold rhetorician" as his antagonist; and again once, startled by the word *Demagogue* occurring in one of the sentences of the King's Book (which word he calls a "goblin word," quite new to the English language till that moment) he says, "'Tis "believed this wording was above his known style and ortho-"graphy, and accuses the whole composure to be conscious "of some other author." Yet, throughout the whole of the *Eikonoklastes*, but for such incidental indications of suspicion, the *Eikon* is called the King's Book, and treated as really the King's. It has been supposed by some that this was policy on Milton's part; but I rather believe that, despite his doubts, the mystery over the *Eikon* was still too dense and general in society to allow him, even in his own mind, to be sure that it was a forgery. Even on his own side there were people who, acknowledging some peculiar literary merits in the book, and thinking these above what might have been expected from anything before known of Charles's faculty in that respect, yet allowed that the thing might be possible. As to those peculiar literary merits, Milton himself, as will have been seen, was by no means among the highly appreciative. Once or twice in the *Eikonoklastes*, however, he yields a little to the general opinion. Thus, one of the chapters of the *Eikon Basilike* beginning with this figure, "With what "willingness I withdrew from Westminster let them judge "who, unprovided of tackling and victual, are forced to sea "by a storm: yet better do so than venture splitting or "sinking on a lee-shore," Milton notices the sentence thus: "The simile wherewith he begins I was about to have found "fault with as in a garb somewhat more poetical than for a "statist [statesman]; but, meeting with many strains of like "dress in other of his Essays, and hearing him reported a "more diligent reader of Poets than of Politicians, I begun to "think that the whole book might perhaps be intended a "piece of Poetry. The words are good, the fiction smooth "and cleanly; there wanted only rime, and that, they say, is "bestowed upon it lately."[1] Again, remarking on a passage in which the King expresses his affection for his wife, he says that it is "in strains that come almost to sonnetting." There is irony in the compliments, but they do allow something in favour of the literary skill of the author of the book, whoever he was. Nor does the engraved frontispiece by Milton's old friend William Marshall escape notice, though less favourable. He speaks of it in the Preface as "the conceited portraiture "before his Book, drawn out to the full measure of a masking "scene, and set there to catch fools and silly gazers"; and he adds, "Quaint emblems and devices, begged from the "old pageantry of some Twelfth-Night's Entertainment at

---

[1] This may be an allusion to *The Divine Penitential Meditations and Vowes of his late Sacred Majesty in his Solitude at Holmby House, faithfully turned into Verse by E. R.: Lond.* 1649 (Lowndes's Bibl. Man. by Bohn, Art. Charles I).

"Whitehall, will do but little to make a saint or martyr." This is the third time, I think, that Milton punishes the engraver Marshall.

In the *Eikonoklastes*, Milton follows the King's Book punctually, chapter by chapter, quoting vital passages from each, and commenting on each, and in fact reviewing in this manner, in the most adverse spirit, all that portion of the King's life, from the calling of the Long Parliament onwards, which the *Eikon Basilike* traverses. The antipathy manifested to Charles throughout is more direct, personal, and savage than in the *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, as if the sentiment of Anti-Royalism had become more intense and rooted in Milton's nature.[1]

One passage near the beginning, which would be sufficiently illustrative of this even if it stood alone, may be quoted first and at length on grounds of independent and literary interest. It is where, after discussing the narrative or argumentative portion of the First Section of the King's Book, he criticises the concluding Prayer of that section, "modelled," as he says, "into the form of a private Psalter." This and the similar succeeding Prayers interspersed to the end, formed, it is to be remembered, the most popular feature of the Book. What piety, what beautiful language, what real devoutness of heart! To Milton, on the contrary, it is no more than "the lip-work of every Prelatical Liturgist, clapt "together and quilted out of Scripture phrase with as much "ease, and as little need of Christian diligence and judgment, "as belongs to the compiling of any ordinary and saleable "piece of English Divinity that the shops value." Besides, had it not always been "the deepest policy of a tyrant to "counterfeit religious?" Were there not historical examples?

---

[1] Yet in the *Def. Sec.* (1654) Milton says, noticing this very charge of personal animosity against Charles: "Not "long afterwards [i. e. after his appointment to the Latin Secretaryship] ap"peared the book attributed to the "King, written certainly with the utmost "malice against the Parliament. Ordered "to reply to it, I opposed *Eikonoklastes* "to the *Eikon*; not insulting the King's "remains, as I am represented, but con"sidering that Queen Truth was to be "preferred to King Charles: nay, as "I foresaw that this calumny might "readily occur to some evil-speaking "person, I guarded against the imputa"tion as much as I could in the Intro"duction itself, and often in other "places."

Nay, had not Dramatic Literature fastened on the fact and turned it to account?

"From stories of this nature, both ancient and modern, which abound, the Poets also, and some English, have been in this point so mindful of decorum as to put never more pious words in the mouth of any person than of a Tyrant. I shall not instance an abstruse author, wherein the King might be less conversant, but one whom we well know was the closet companion of these his solitudes, WILLIAM SHAKESPEARE; who introduces the person of Richard the Third speaking in as high a strain of piety and mortification as is uttered in any passage of this book, and sometimes to the same sense and purpose with some words in this place. '*I intended*,' saith he [King Charles in the preceding part of the *Eikon*] '*not only to oblige my friends, but mine enemies.* The like saith Richard, Act II., Scene i.:

'I do not know that Englishman alive
With whom my soul is any jot at odds
More than the infant that is born tonight:
I thank my God for my humility.'

Other stuff of this sort may be read throughout the whole tragedy, wherein the Poet used not much license in departing from the truth of History; which delivers him [Richard] a deep dissembler, not of his affections only, but of Religion.[1]

In praying, therefore, and in the outward work of devotion, this King, we see, hath not at all exceeded the worst of Kings before him. But herein the worst of Kings, professing Christianism, have by far exceeded him. They, for aught we know, have still prayed their own, or at least borrowed from fit authors. But this King, not content with that which, although in a thing holy, is no holy theft,—to attribute to his own making other men's whole prayers,—hath as it were unhallowed and unchristened the very duty of Prayer itself by borrowing to a Christian use prayers offered to a Heathen God. Who would have imagined so little fear in him of the true all-seeing Deity, so little reverence of the Holy Ghost, whose office is to dictate and present our Christian prayers, so little care of truth in his last words, or honour to himself or to his friends, or sense of his afflictions, or of that sad hour which was upon him, as immediately before his death to pop into the hand of that grave bishop [Juxon] who attended him, as a special relic of his saintly exercises, a prayer stolen word for word from the mouth of a heathen woman praying to a Heathen God, and that in no serious book, but in the vain amatorious poem of Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia*: a book in that kind full of worth and wit, but among religious thoughts and duties not worthy to be named, nor to be read at any time without good caution, much less in time of trouble and affliction to be a Christian's prayer-book? It hardly can be thought upon without some laughter that he who had acted over us so stately and so tragically should leave the world at last with such a ridiculous exit as to bequeathe among his deifying friends that stood about him such a piece of mockery to be published by them as must needs cover both his and their heads with shame and confusion. And sure it was the hand of God that let them fall and be taken in such a foolish trap as hath exposed them to all derision, if for nothing else, to throw contempt and disgrace in the sight of all men upon this his idolized Book, and the whole rosary of his Prayers: thereby testifying how little He accepted them from those who thought no better of the Living God than of a buzzard Idol, that would be served and worshipped with the polluted trash of Romances and Arcadias, without discerning the affront so irreligiously and so boldly offered him to his face.

---

[1] It is only a hasty reading of this passage that would construe it as contemptuous of Shakespeare, or in any way a retractation in 1649 of Milton's splendid youthful outburst in 1630, *What needs my Shakespeare?* &c. The boundless veneration for Shakespeare in those lines is indeed gone in this passage; but Milton's immediate purpose was peculiar, and his words are carefully weighed. The words "*stuff of this sort*," following the quotation from *Richard III.*, do not refer to the verses themselves, but to the sentiment, so false on Richard's part, which they express. It is as if Milton said, "Shakespeare, who was a good judge of human nature, could make kings talk plausible stuff of this sort to any extent."

Thus much be said in general to his Prayers, and in especial to that Arcadian Prayer used in his captivity: enough to undeceive us what esteem we are to set upon the rest!"[1]

This exposure of the theft of a Prayer by the King or his executors from Sidney's *Arcadia* came to be the most galling passage to the Royalists in the whole of the *Eikonoklastes*, and is the most famous passage of the book to this day. In explanation, however, it ought to be added that the Prayer in question is not one of those that occur in the *Eikon Basilike* proper (where, as has been mentioned, nearly every chapter ends with a Prayer printed in Italics), but is one of a few that were appended to some of the earlier and more expensive editions of the book, with this separate title, "*Praiers used by His Majestie in the time of His Sufferings. Delivered to Doctor Juxon, bishop of London, immediately before his death.*" There are four such appended "Prayers" in the copy now before me, the first of which headed "A Praier in time of Captivitie" is the one that Milton detected and blasted. His exposure of the plagiarism would have been clearer and more effective if he had printed in parallel columns the original Prayer as it stands in Sidney's *Arcadia* and the copy of the same as it stood in the King's Book. We shall now do this for him:—

---

[1] The quotation here, the reader will understand, is from the First Edition of the *Eikonoklastes*. In the Second Edition the passage was much enlarged.

Prayer of the afflicted Pamela, in her chamber, (overheard by Cecropia, who is listening at the door).	A Prayer in time of Captivity.
From *Sidney's Arcadia*: Book III., near the beginning:— "Kneeling down even where she stood, she thus said:—	From "Prayers used by his "Majesty in the time of his "Sufferings;" appended to copies of the *Eikon Basilike* of Edition of "1648."
"O all-seeing Light and Eternal Life of all things, to whom nothing is either so great that it may resist or so small that it is contemned: look upon my misery with thine eye of mercy, and let thine infinite power vouchsafe to limit out some proportion of deliverance unto me, as to thee shall seem most convenient. Let not injury, O Lord, triumph over me; and let my faults by thy hand be corrected; and make not mine unjust Enemy the minister of thy justice. But, my God, if in thy wisdom this be the aptest chastisement for my inexcusable folly, if this low bondage be fittest for my over-high desires, if the pride of my not enough humble heart be	"O Powerful and Eternal God! to whom nothing is so great that it may resist, or so small that it is contemned: look upon my misery with thine eye of mercy, and let thine infinite Power vouchsafe to limit out some proportion of deliverance unto me, as to Thee shall seem most convenient. Let not injury, O Lord, triumph over me, and let my faults by thy hand be corrected; and make not my unjust enemies the ministers of Thy Justice. But yet, my God, if in Thy wisdom this be the aptest chastisement for my unexcusable transgressions, if this ingrateful bondage be fittest for my over-high desires, if the pride of my (not enough humble) heart be thus to be broken, O Lord, I yield unto Thy will, and cheerfully embrace what

thus to be broken, O Lord, I yield unto thy will, and joyfully embrace what sorrow thou wilt have me suffer. Only thus much let me crave of thee—let my craving, O Lord, be accepted of thee, since even that proceeds from thee—let me crave, even by the noblest title which in my greatest affliction I may give myself, that I am thy creature, and by thy goodness, which is thyself, that thou wilt suffer some beam of thy Majesty so to shine into my mind that it may still depend confidently upon thee. Let calamity be the exercise, but not the overthrow, of my virtue. Let their power prevail, but prevail not to destruction. Let my greatness be their prey; let my pain be the sweetness of their revenge; let them (if so it seem good unto thee) vex me with more and more punishment: but, O Lord, let never their wickedness have such a hand but that I may carry a pure mind in a pure body; and" pausing a while, "O most gracious Lord," said she—"whatever becomes of me, preserve the virtuous Musidorus."

sorrow Thou wilt have me suffer. Only thus much let me crave of Thee (let my craving, O Lord, be accepted of, since *it* even proceeds from Thee) that, by Thy goodness, which is Thyself, Thou wilt suffer some beam of Thy Majesty so to shine in my mind that I, who acknowledge it my noblest title to be Thy creature, may still, in my greatest afflictions, depend confidently on Thee. Let calamities be the exercise, but not the overthrow, of my virtue. O let not their prevailing power be to my destruction. And, if it be Thy will that they more and more vex me with punishment, yet, O Lord, never let wickedness have such a hand but that I may still carry a pure mind and a steadfast resolution ever to serve Thee, without fear or presumption, yet with that humble confidence which may best please Thee; so that at the last I may come to Thy Eternal Kingdom, through the merits of Thy Son, our alone Saviour, Jesus Christ. Amen."

The following excerpts from the *Eikonoklastes*, to each of which I affix a descriptive heading, will sufficiently represent the matter and opinions of the book and its general style. The Italics in Milton's text are his quotations from the King's Book:—

USE OF MOB-ACTION IN POLITICS:—"*They* [the London Mobs of 1641–2] *forebore not rude deportments, contemptuous words and actions, to himself and his Court.* It was more wonder, having heard what treacherous hostility he had designed against the City and the whole Kingdom [in the Arrest of the Five

Members], that they forbore to handle him as people in their rage have handled Tyrants heretofore for less offences . . . *They first petitioned, then protested, dictate next, and lastly overawe the Parliament. They removed obstructions, they purged the Houses, cast out rotten members.*—If there were a man of iron, such as Talus by our poet Spenser [F. Q. Book. V. Canto II] is feigned to be, the page of Justice, who with his iron flail could do all this, and expeditiously, without those deceitful forms and circumstances of law, worse than ceremonies in Religion, I say: God send it done, whether by one Talus or by a thousand."

A CROWN OF THORNS:—"*He had rather wear a Crown of Thorns with our Saviour.*—Many would be all one with our Saviour whom our Saviour will not know. They who govern ill those kingdoms which they *had* a right to have to our Saviour's Crown of Thorns no right at all. Thorns they may find enow, of their own gathering and their own twisting; for thorns and snares, saith Solomon, are in the way of the froward; but to wear them as our Saviour wore them is not given to them that suffer by their own demerits."

CRUELTIES OF CHARLES'S REIGN:—"He asks *whose innocent blood he hath shed, what widow's or orphan's tears can witness against him?*—After the suspected poisoning of his father, not inquired into, but smothered up, and him [Buckingham] protected and advanced to the very half of his kingdom who was accused in Parliament to be the author of the fact! After so many years of cruel war on his People in three Kingdoms! Whence the author of TRUTHS MANIFEST, a Scotchman not unacquainted with affairs, positively affirms 'that there hath been more Christian 'blood shed by the commission, approbation, and connivance of 'King Charles and his father James, in the latter end of their reign, 'than in the Ten Roman Persecutions.' Not to speak of those many whippings, pillories, and other corporal inflictions wherewith his reign also before the war was not unbloody, some have died in prison under cruel restraint, others in banishment, whose lives were shortened through the rigour of that persecution wherewith so many years he infested the true Church. And those Six Members all men judged to have escaped no less than capital danger; whom he so greedily pursuing into the House of Commons had not there the forbearance to conceal how much it humbled him that 'the birds were flown.' If some vulture in the mountains could have opened his beak intelligibly and spoke, what fitter words could he have uttered at the loss of his prey?"

THE CORONATION OATH. — "Concerning his *Coronation Oath*, what it was, and how far it bound him, already hath been spoken. This we may take for certain, that he was never sworn to his own particular conscience and reason, but to our conditions as a free people; which required him to give us such laws as ourselves shall choose. This the Scots could bring him to, and would not be baffled by the pretence of a Coronation Oath, after that Episcopacy had for many years been settled there. Which concession of his to them, and not to us, he seeks here to put off with evasions that are ridiculous."

THE NASEBY LETTERS: — "The King's Letters taken at the Battle of Naseby, being of greatest importance to let people see what faith there was in all his promises and solemn protestations, were transmitted to public view by special order of the Parliament. They discovered his good affection to Papists and Irish Rebels, the strait intelligence he held, the pernicious and dishonourable peace he made, with them, not solicited, but rather soliciting; which by all invocations that were holy he had in public abjured. They revealed his endeavours to bring in foreign forces, Irish, French, Dutch, Lorrainers, and our old invaders the Danes, upon us, besides his subtleties and mysterious arts in treating. To sum up all, they showed him governed by a woman."

LIFE OF CHARLES I., AND EDUCATION OF CHARLES II.:—"How voluptuously, how idly, reigning in the hands of other men, he either tyrannized or trifled away those seventeen years of peace [1625–1642], without care or thought, as if to be a King had been nothing else in his apprehension but to eat and drink, and have his will, and take his pleasure, though there be who can relate his domestic life to the exactness of a diary, there shall be here no mention made. This yet we might have then foreseen —that he who spent his leisure so remissly and so corruptly to his own pleasing would one day or other [1642–1646] be worse busied and employed to our sorrow. And that he acted in earnest what Rehoboam did but threaten, to make his little finger heavier than his father's loins, and to whip us with his two twisted scorpions, both Temporal and Spiritual Tyranny, all his Kingdoms have felt. What good use he made afterward of his adversity [1646–1649] both his impenitence and obstinacy to the end (for he was no Manasseh) and the sequel of these his Meditated Resolutions abundantly express: retaining, commending, teaching to his Son, all those putrid and pernicious documents, both of State and of Religion, instilled by wicked Doctors, and received by him as in a vessel nothing better seasoned, which were the first occasion both of his own and all *our* miseries. And, if he in the best maturity of his years and understanding made no better use to himself or others of his so long and manifold afflictions, either looking up to God or looking down upon the reason of his own affairs, there can be no probability that his Son, bred up not in the soft effeminacies of Court only, but in the rugged and more boisterous license of undisciplined camps and garrisons, for years unable to reflect with judgment upon his condition, and thus ill instructed by his Father, should give his mind to walk by any other rules than these, bequeathed him as on the death-bed of his Father."

CHARLES II. AT THE HAGUE:—"He exhorts his Son *not to study revenge.* But how far he, or at least they about him, intend to follow the exhortation, was seen lately at the Hague [assassination of Dorislaus], and by what attempts were likewise made in other places. How implacable they would be it will be wisdom and our safety to believe rather and prevent than to make trial."

THE STRONGEST THING IN THE WORLD.—"It happened once, as we find in Esdras and Josephus (authors not less believed than any under sacred) to be a great and solemn debate in the Court of Darius what thing was to be accounted strongest of all other. He that could resolve this, in reward of his excelling wisdom, should be clad in purple, drink in gold, sleep in a bed of gold, and sit next to Darius. None but they doubtless who were reputed wise had the question propounded to them. Who, after some respite given them by the King to consider, in full assembly of all his lords and gravest counsellors returned severally what they thought. The first held that WINE was the strongest; another that the KING was the strongest. But Zorobabel, prince of the captive Jews and heir to the crown of Judah, being one of them, proved WOMEN to be stronger than the King, for that he himself had seen a concubine take his crown off his head to set it upon her own: and others besides him have lately seen the like feat done, and not in jest! Yet he [Zorobabel] proved on, and it was so yielded by the King himself, that neither Wine nor Women nor the King, but TRUTH, of all other things was the strongest.

For me, though neither asked, nor in a nation that gives such rewards to wisdom, I shall pronounce my sentence somewhat different from Zorobabel, and shall defend that either Truth and Justice are all one (for Truth is but Justice in our Knowledge and Justice is but Truth in our Practice, and he indeed so explains himself in saying that with Truth is no accepting of persons, which is the property of Justice) or else, if there be any odds, that JUSTICE, though not stronger than Truth, yet by her office is to put forth and exhibit more strength in the affairs of mankind. For Truth is properly no more than contemplation, and her utmost efficiency is but teaching; but JUSTICE in her very essence is all strength and activity, and hath a sword put into her hand to use against all violence and oppression on the Earth. She it is most truly who accepts no person, and exempts none from the severity of her stroke."

MISINTERPRETATION OF THE COVENANT:—"If the Covenant were made absolute, to preserve and defend any one whomsoever, without respect had either to the true Religion or those other superior things to be defended and preserved however [Milton does not think this a necessary interpretation of it, and has said so], it cannot then be doubted but that the Covenant was rather a most foolish, hasty, and unlawful vow than a deliberate and well-weighed Covenant; swearing us into labyrinths and repugnances, no way to be solved or reconciled, and therefore no way to be kept."

POPULARITY OF THE EIKON BASILIKE:—"Such Prayers as these may perhaps catch the People, as was intended; but how they please God is to be much doubted, though prayed in secret, much less written to be divulged. Which perhaps may gain him after death a short, contemptible, and soon fading reward: not what he aims at, to stir the constancy and solid firmness of any wise man, or to unsettle the conscience of any knowing Christian (if he could ever aim at a thing so hopeless, and above the genius of his cleric elocution); but to catch the worthless approbation of an inconstant, irrational, and Image-doting rabble. The rest, whom perhaps ignorance without malice, or some error less than fatal, hath for the time misled on this side sorcery or obduration, may find the grace and good guidance to bethink themselves and recover."

In putting the *Eikonoklastes* first among the incidents of our present portion of Milton's life we have hardly anticipated its place; for, though it was not published till Oct. 6, 1649, it must have been in preparation, and much of it written, before Cromwell's departure for Ireland on the 10th of July. The more miscellaneous facts of Milton's official life from that date to the end of the First year of the Commonwealth are presented in the following series of annotated extracts from the Order Books of the Council of State, including not only the minutes of Council which mention him by name, but also certain others in which he was really concerned:—

Monday, July 16, 1649:—Ordered by the Council, "That "Mr. Randolph be continued in his place of Clerk of the Papers of "State at Whitehall, and that he shall have his pension of Fourscore "Pounds *per annum* paid unto him by £20 per quarter, and that "the first quarter shall be paid as due at Midsummer last; and "MR. MILTON is to have an inspection into that office." This means that Mr. Randolph was not to be disturbed in his post of the Keepership of the State Paper Office for the time, but that Milton was to supervise him, and at all events have access to any papers he wanted to see.

Thursday, July 19. Present, Bradshaw, Wallop, Jones, Fairfax, Holland, Harrington, Pickering, Mildmay, Pennington, and Lord Grey of Groby. Ordered, "That MR. STERRY be appointed "to be preacher to this Council, and that he shall have lodgings "assigned him in Whitehall." Owen and Thomas Goodwin had been chiefly in request hitherto for the opening prayers at Council; but, Owen having gone to Ireland, Sterry now came in his place.

Saturday, Aug. 4:—"That order be given to the Officers of the "Guard that no women who clamour upon the Council upon the "pretence of debts due to them from the Parliament be permitted "to come within the walls of this House." There must have been many poor women with claims against the Parliament; and Milton's mother-in-law, Mrs. Powell, was one of them, though she can hardly have been one of those that tried this desperate means of redress.—Before the end of the year, however, she did begin her troublesome suit by a Petition addressed to the "Commissioners of Parliament for Relief upon Articles." In this Petition, dated Nov. 16, 1649, she recapitulated the substance of what the reader already knows (Vol. III. pp. 471–487 and pp. 632–640): viz. that, though her late husband ought to have had the benefit of the Articles made at the surrender of Oxford to Fairfax in June, 1646, yet, in violation of those Articles, his household goods and moveables at Forest Hill had been seized and sold by the sequestrators for Parliament, and Parliament itself had made away with £400 worth of wood also belonging to him. On the ground that "petitioner, as executrix to her said husband, is now sued, in "several courts of justice at Westminster, for many debts due "to divers persons, and is no way able either to satisfy the same or "provide a scanty subsistence for herself and nine children," she prays the Commissioners to take means for the restoration of the goods and timber, or of the value thereof. The Commissioners, of whom Bradshaw was one, referred the petition to the Committee for Composition with Delinquents, and this Committee reported (Dec. 14) that the late Mr. Powell had applied for leave to compound on the 6th of Aug., 1646, and had certainly then included £400 worth of timber in his statement of his property to be compounded for, but that no part of the fine fixed for the composition had ever since been paid, and consequently the transaction was incomplete. So, for the time, Mrs. Powell was baffled.[1]

Tuesday, Aug. 14:—"That a warrant be issued out to the "Keeper of Newgate for the apprehending of MARCHAMOUNT "NEEDHAM, *alias* PRAGMATICUS, lately prisoner in Newgate, and "now escaped" (see ante p. 89).

Monday, Aug. 20:—Warrant to search for certain scandalous pamphlets and books in a certain place, now ready to come forth.

Saturday, Sept. 1:—"That THOMAS NEWCOME, printer, of "London, shall be committed to the prison of Newgate for "printing part of a seditious pamphlet containing treason against "the State." The pamphlet was Lilburne's *Outcry of the Young Men and Apprentices of London*, out three days before (ante p. 119).

Tuesday, Sept. 4:—"That Mr. Frost do take care that MR. "SIMMONS the Printer be satisfied for his printing of some books "put out under the title of *Discoverer*."—This is Milton's Matthew Simmons of the Gilded Lion, Aldersgate Street; the *Discoverer*, for which he was to be paid, is the exposure of Lilburne and the Levellers already mentioned (ante p. 97), and which Milton, as I fancied, though himself first entrusted with the business by the Council, had deputed to Mr. Hall, as the Council's hack.

Saturday, Sept. 15:—"That all the members of the Council "shall have keys to the Garden at Whitehall: that the Secretary "[Mr. Frost, sen.] also shall have a key to the said Garden. That "Mrs. Hampden [Hampden's widow, I think] shall have a passage "into St. James's Park, and that she be desired to have a care who "pass through by means of that key."—"That Mr. Holland, Mr. Scott, "Col. Jones, or any two of them, be appointed a Committee to "whom the Serjeant-at-arms may resort for the putting of all such

---

[1] Documents given in *Milton Papers* (Camden Society) by Mr. W. Douglas Hamilton, pp. 78—81.

"out of the lodgings in Whitehall as are not of the Council of "State or have relation unto them."

Friday, Sept. 21. Present, Bradshaw, Masham, Wallop, Lord Chief Justice St. John, Heveningham, Scott, Robinson, Viscount Lisle, and Jones:—"That Mr. Frost shall be the person whom the "Council doth authorise to publish intelligence every week upon "Thursday, according to an Act of Parliament for that purpose." This will be farther explained.—Same day, the printer Newcome is discharged on his recognisances.

Saturday, Sept. 29:—"That order be given to Mr. Young, "late Keeper of the Books and Medals at St. James's to make an "inventory of those things which were in his custody, and to have "it ready by this day sevennight." This is the old Scotchman, Patrick Young, Librarian to the late King, and one of Milton's acquaintances (see Vol. III. p. 645–646).

Saturday, Oct. 13:—Bradshaw and five others of the Council appointed a Committee to consider the best means of putting in force the new Press Act of Sept. 20.

Wednesday, Oct. 17: "That 500 copies of Mr. Hall his answer to "Mr. Prynne be printed in Latin, and that the charge of it be "defrayed by the Council." This was another piece of Mr. Hall's hackwork; but I have not seen it. Prynne had published several new pamphlets in the course of 1649.

Wednesday, Oct. 24:—"That a warrant be issued to Mr. Milton "and to Mr. Serjeant Dendy to view the books and papers of "Mr. Clement Walker that are seized at Kensington, and such "others as he hath here in Westminster or elsewhere, and to report "what they find therein to the Council."[1] That very day Walker had been arrested for his *Anarchia Anglicana* or Second Part of his *History of Independency* (ante p. 121).

Friday Oct. 26:—"That the Wardens of the Company of "Stationers in London be summoned to appear before the Council "of State to-morrow, to make answer to such questions as shall be "offered unto them concerning their own business."

Wednesday, Oct. 31. Present, Bradshaw, Fairfax, Armyn, Pennington, Jones, Hutchinson, Heveningham, Stapley, and Purefoy: —"That Richard Royston shall be bound in recognisances with "two sureties in £500 to be forthcoming when the Council shall "call for him; and that he shall not henceforth cause to be printed, "nor sell, nor cause to be sold, any unlicensed or scandalous books "or pamphlets, contrary to the late Act published in that behalf." —This Richard Royston, a well-known Royalist publisher in London, was, in fact, the original publisher of the *Eikon Basilike*, and therefore a marked man with the Council of State. This may be the place, accordingly, for the trade-history of that mysterious book, so far as I can gather it, from obscure hints and tangled and inconsistent testimonies, to the date of the present entry :—In October, 1648, when Charles I. was still in the Isle of Wight, and the Treaty of Newport was still dragging itself on, Royston, who had printed for his Majesty before, had a message from him to be ready to print some papers that were to be sent. Not long after, either when the King was at Hurst Castle, or just when he had been brought from Hurst Castle to Windsor, and the Army Chiefs and the Purged House of Commons were making arrangements for bringing him to trial (i. e. in Dec. 1648), Royston did receive what he believed to be the promised papers. They were conveyed to him by a Rev. Edward Symmons, who had been chaplain to the Prince of Wales, and had published a book vindicating the King from the attack upon him on account of his Papers taken at Naseby. Perceiving the importance of the manuscript, and its bearing on the King's critical condition, Royston had it printed with all despatch, but with the greatest precautions for secrecy. He employed several different printing-presses, but chiefly those of a Mr. William Dugard, an excellent printer, who combined his trade-business with the duties of no less important an office than the mastership of Merchant Taylors' School, and was well-known to London scholars in both capacities. *Suspiria Regalia*, or *The Royal Plea*, had been the original title in the manuscript; but it was changed, for press, by instructions sent to Royston, into *Eikon Basilike.* The book was ready just at the time of the King's execution, and was out in London, as we have seen, on the 9th of February, 1648–9, ten days after the execution, and then, of course, unregistered and without any printer's name (ante p. 33). The tradition, from Royston himself, is that he had taken care to have 2000 copies that day, at fifteen shillings each, in the hands of hawkers; and through the next five weeks, by hawkers, or at the regular bookshops, the sale was such as to keep Dugard's and other presses constantly at work. What the Council of State may have tried to do at first towards stopping the book is not known; and not till March 16 did Parliament issue their order for seizing it. On that very day, however, there was this extraordinary entry in the books of the Stationers' Company: "*Mr. Simmons entered for his copy, under* "*the hands of Mr. Caryl and Mr. Dawson, warden, a book called* "Εικων Βασιλικη: *the Portraiture of his late Majesty in his solitude* "*and sufferings.*" The entry, as it is now to be seen in the books, is deleted with three crosses, and there is this explanatory note in the margin: "*This is crossed out by my own hand, Aug.* 6, 1651, Matthew Simmons, *at a Court held that day.*" How shall we explain this marvel? An edition of the King's Book licensed by one of the Council of State's own favourite preachers, and entered as the copyright of Milton's own Matthew Simmons, the Commonwealth's chief bookseller, five weeks after Royston's issue of the book, and on the very day when Parliament ordered all copies of it to be seized! One may form various hypotheses; but the fact seems to be that the intention was temporary, and that the book remained under ban, Royston issuing new copies in thousands furtively and at his peril, and other unlicensed reprints appearing in various forms. Royston, as we have seen, also brought out (May 29) *The Papers which passed at Newcastle betwixt His Sacred Majesty and Mr. Alexander Henderson,* having taken the precaution of obtaining Mr. Downham's licence for them in proper form; which precaution, however, did not save him from being called to account by the Council of State for that virtual sequel to the *Eikon,* or at least for the frontispiece to it (ante p. 88). And so Royston, a most respectable man, had been more or less in trouble for months, questioned over and over again about the *Eikon,* but unable or unwilling to give further information about it than that he had received it, as above mentioned, through Mr. Edward Symmons, and genuinely believed it to be the King's. Mr. Edward Symmons himself was now no more. He had been arrested at Gravesend on his way to France during the first excitement about the book, but had caught the small-pox and died (March 29). Save, therefore, that one or two vague hints pointing to other authorship than the King's had been obtained —hints made public by Goodwin in his *Obstructors of Justice,* by the author of *Eikon Alethine,* and finally by Milton in his *Eikonoklastes*—the Council of State itself remained as much in the dark as to the origin of the book as the rest of the world. And now, as we see, the *Eikonoklastes* being at length out, they were disposed to trust to that means of counteracting the *Eikon,* and to let Royston alone on recognisances for his future good behaviour.[1]

---

[1] I had missed this particular entry in my own notes from the Council Order Books; and I take it from Mr. Bisset's *Omitted Chapters of the History of England*, p. 172. Mrs. Green, who notes the issue of the warrant under the same date (Calendar, p. 550), says that Milton's name occurs in the warrant itself, but not in the minute in the Order Book.

Friday, Nov. 2:—MR. THOMAS GOODWIN is conjoined with Sterry in the Chaplaincy to the Council. They are to have £200 a year each (i.e. about £700 a year now), and lodgings in Whitehall.

Wednesday, Nov. 14:—"That a warrant be issued to the Keeper "of Newgate for the discharge of MR. NEEDHAM, the said Mr.

---

[1] Wood's Ath. IV. 703; Nichols's *Literary Anecdotes,* I. 522—9; Collection of original testimonies as to the publication of the *Eikon,* given in Dr. Christopher Wordsworth's *Who wrote Eikon Basilike?* (1824) pp. 16—28 and 131—145; my notes from Stationers' Registers and Thomason Catalogue. In the Stationers' Registers, under date Dec. 31, 1649, there is this entry: "Rich. Royston entered for his copy, under the hands of Mr. Downham and Mr. Flesher, a book called Mercurius Pæd., or a Short and Sure Way to the Latin Tongue, by Jo. Phillips." Can this possibly be Milton's younger nephew, beginning his precocious authorship, at the age of eighteen, by some account of his uncle's system of Latin teaching; and can Milton have arranged the thing with the now docile Royston?

"Needham first taking the Test [i. e. the Engagement]."[1] After three months of confinement, therefore, *Pragmaticus* had been forgiven all his scurrilities. We shall see the reason.

Monday, Nov. 19. Present, Bradshaw, Jones, Stapley, Mildmay, Walton, Sir H. Vane, Holland, Constable, Robinson, and Purefoy:—*Ordered,* "That MR. MILTON shall have the lodgings "that were in the hands of Sir John Hippesley in Whitehall, for "his accommodation as being Secretary to this Council for Foreign "Languages." Sir John Hippesley, knt., had been M.P. for Cockermouth since the beginning of the Parliament.

Wednesday, Nov. 21:—"The letters concerning Lady Killigrew, "in the custody of MR. MILTON, to be brought to Council, that "some resolution may be taken about the pass desired." As long ago as May 12 there had been a council-warrant to the Serjeant-at-arms "to seize Lady Killigrew at the Savoy, suspected of holding intelligence with the enemy, and her letters, papers, and ciphers." Probably because some of the papers were in foreign languages, they had been lying in Milton's custody. Actually, three days afterwards (Nov. 24), the pass "to go beyond seas" *was* granted to the Lady.[2]

Thursday, Nov. 29. Present, Bradshaw, Constable, Masham, the Earl of Denbigh, Ludlow, Scott, Heveningham, Hutchinson, Whitlocke, and, later, Viscount Lisle, Holland, Purefoy, Bond, Vane, Mr. Lisle, Popham, the Earl of Pembroke, Mildmay, and Stapley:—*Ordered,* "That a letter be written unto the Com-"missioners of the Customs, to desire them to give order that "a very strict search may be made of such ships as come from the "Netherlands, for certain scandalous books which are there printed "against the government of this Commonwealth, entitled DEFENSIO "REGIA, and which are designed to be sent over hither, and to "desire them that, if any of them upon search shall be found, they "may be sent up to the Council of State without suffering any of "them to be otherwise disposed of upon any pretence whatsoever.— "That a warrant be directed to the Master and Wardens of the "Company of Stationers to the purpose aforementioned.—That the "like letter be written to Mr. Thomas Bendish, an officer in the "port of Yarmouth, to take care of searching for the above said "book which is expected to come out of Holland."—This is the first mention of the book of the great SALMASIUS, of which we are to hear so much. "*Defensio Regia pro Carolo I. Ad Serenissimum Magnæ Britanniæ Regem Carolum II., filium natu majorem, heredem et successorem legitimum. Sumptibus Regiis anno CIƆIƆCXLIX*" ("Royal Defence for Charles I. To the most Serene King of Great Britain, Charles II., his eldest son, and lawful heir and successor.

---

[1] Mrs. Green quotes (Calendar, p. 554) the Council's warrant, of the same date, to the keeper of Newgate, "to set Mar-"mion Needham at liberty." *Marmion* is a mistake for *Marchamont.*

[2] This particular entry I take from Mrs. Green's Calendar, having missed it in my own readings in the Order Books. See her Calendar for 1649—50, pp. 401, 532, 556.

At the King's expense, 1649"): such was the title of this famous book, printed in folio and also as a duodecimo of 444 pages, the importation of which from Holland the Council of State was so anxious to prevent.[1]

Monday, Dec. 31:—"That Dr. Paget be recommended to be "physician to the Tower." We shall hear of Dr. Paget farther, in connexion with Milton. Same day:—"That the Committee for "private Examinations [of which Mr. Scott was chairman] do "examine the printers who are printing the *History of Independency*, "and to commit the printers if they see cause." Though Clement Walker was in prison, they were, it seems, reprinting his book.

Tuesday, Jan. 8, 1649–50. Present, Bradshaw, the Earl of Pembroke, Pickering, Wallop, Lord Chief Baron Wylde, Viscount Lisle, Purefoy, Bond, Whitlocke, Scott, and Heveningham. Several important orders this day, among which were the following:—(1) "That MR. PATRICK YOUNG shall be Library-Keeper of the "Library of St. James's, and that he shall make, with what speed "he can, a Catalogue of what books, medals, and other things, "belonging to the Library, are there remaining, and what of them "are missing." Thus the old Scotchman was kept in his office. A Committee was to consider what would be "a fit subsistence" for him. (2) "That £100 be paid unto Mr. Thomas Waring for "his pains and charges in compiling of a book containing several "examinations of the Bloody Massacre in Ireland. . . . That "MR. MILTON do confer with some printer or stationer concerning "the speedy printing of the book, and give an account of what he "hath done therein to the Council. That MR. MILTON do prepare "something in answer to the Book of Salmasius, and when he hath "done it bring it to the Council."—The last item in this complex entry is the most momentous. The Council had found it impossible to stop the importation of Salmasius's book; and at all events it was circulating on the Continent and doing infinite mischief. Mr. Milton must answer it, as he had answered the King's own Book!—We have Milton's own authority (*Def. Sec.*) for the fact that he was present at this meeting of Council, or at all events at the meeting at which the idea of his writing an answer to Salmasius was first started, and that the duty was unanimously and urgently pressed upon him.

Monday, Jan. 14:—A supply of "The Public Acts" and of "MR. MILTON'S books" to be sent to Mr. Robinson, "to spread in "those parts where he is." Had Mr. Luke Robinson, a member of the Council of State, gone abroad for a while; and did the Council think the circulation of these books by him might help to correct foreign misconceptions as to the character of the Commonwealth? The books of Milton to be sent must have been copies of his *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* and *Eikonoklastes*.[1]

---

[1] If the Catalogue of the Thomason Collection is to be trusted, they were somewhat late in their endeavour; for a copy of the book, in two volumes, is there entered as in Thomason's hands on the 11th of May. But surely there must be some error in an entry which would infer that so long and elaborate a book in Latin had been arranged for, written, and printed within three months after the king's death. At all events, now, in November 1649, the bales of the dreadful book were first expected.

Friday, Jan. 25 :—A letter from the Governor of Tituan referred to the Admiralty Committee; and "MR. MILTON to have "the above letter translated."[2] The letter seems to have been from Tetuan in Morocco, near the Straits of Gibraltar.

Tuesday, Jan. 29 :—"That MR. MILTON do prepare a letter to "be sent unto the Governor of Tituan in answer to his letter to the "Council." There is no trace of this letter in Milton's preserved State dispatches.

Friday, Feb. 1 :—"That MR. DUGARD be committed prisoner to "Newgate for printing scandalous and seditious pamphlets against the "Parliament; that his presses and implements for printing be seized "by Joseph Hunscot [the beadle of the Stationers' Company], and by "him kept until the Council shall give further order therein; that a "letter be written unto the Company of Merchant Taylors of London "to proceed to an election of a schoolmaster, Mr. Dugard being a man "who hath shown himself an enemy to the State by printing scan-"dalous and seditious pamphlets against the Parliament, and therefore "do [*sic*] conceive him very unfit to have the charge of the education "of youth." Also, "That Mr. John Armstrong, corrector to Mr. "Dugard's printing press, be apprehended, and brought in safe "custody before this Council."—The MR. WILLIAM DUGARD on whom the Council were thus severe had been, as we have seen, the chief printer of the first editions of the *Eikon Basilike,* for the publisher Royston (ante p. 148); but his new and special crime seems to have been that he was printing an English edition of Salmasius's *Defensio Regia*. We shall hear more of him in a while.

Saturday, Feb. 2 :—"That orders be sent to Mr. Baker, "Mr. Challoner, Mr. Weckherlin, Mr. Willingham, or any others "who have in their hands any public papers belonging to the "Commonwealth, to deliver them to MR. MILTON, to be laid up "in the Paper Office for public service; and that Mr. Baker be "appointed to order [arrange] those papers that may be ready for "use."

Some of these Minutes are sufficiently intelligible by themselves, and are particles of Milton's Biography. For their full purport, however, they must be a little systematised.

On due study, they enable us to see very distinctly that world of official life in Old Whitehall to which Milton belonged. What we now call Whitehall, consisting only of

---

[1] From Mrs. Green's Calendar, p. 481.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 493.

Inigo Jones's Banqueting House and one or two small adjuncts, is but a fragment of the Old Whitehall, as it had grown, by successive additions, from the time of Henry VIII., and gives us no idea of the extent of that once famous Palace. It stretched from the present Scotland Yard to the present Canon Row, Westminster, with only its minor frontage to what is now the great thoroughfare between these two points, and with its chief frontage at what is now the back, looking upon the Thames. There was a mass of intricate building, mainly in the Tudor style, with courts, galleries, gateways from court to court, passages wide and narrow, and one public way through all, from Charing Cross to Westminster. Inside there were all varieties of accommodation, from the splendid chief rooms, to snug chambers and apartments distributed round and accessible by staircases. There was ample space, therefore, for all the purposes for which the premises were now used by the Commonwealth. As it was convenient for the members of Council to be near the Council-room, such of them as desired it had permanent residences there, or chambers which they could occasionally inhabit. The best portions of the Palace were doubtless appropriated to these "Grandees"; but their secretary, Mr. Frost, might have very good rooms, and other *attachés* of the Council might have rooms as well, and still leave rooms to spare There was no difficulty, it seems, in providing lodgings for Mr. Sterry and Mr. Goodwin within the Palace; and, at last, Milton's duties about the Council having become more numerous and close, he was offered rooms there too (Nov. 19). As they had been occupied by Sir John Hippesley, they were probably handsome enough for the standard of that period. They were, at all events, at the Scotland Yard end of the Palace; for his nephew Phillips, on whose authority we saw him remove, in or about April 1649, from High Holborn to Thomson's at Spring Gardens, Charing Cross, to be near the Council, adds that he remained at Thomson's only "till his designed apartment in Scotland Yard was prepared for him," and that he was soon located there more comfortably. He had been perhaps about seven months in Thomson's house, and the removal thence to the new apartments in Whitehall was little more than crossing the street.[1]

A great deal of work, we can see, was thrown upon Mr. Frost by Bradshaw's new Press Act of September 20. By that Act, relaxing or nearly ignoring the Licensing System for books in general, but retaining it strictly for Newspapers, the disagreeable duty of licensing and supervising these last, vacated by Mabbott four months before, had been divided among three persons—the Clerk of the Parliament, the Army-Secretary, and any third person that the Council of State might appoint. The Clerk of the Parliament was Mr. Henry Scobell; the Army-Secretary was still John Rushworth; and on the 21st of September, the very day after the Act was passed, the Council had appointed Mr. Frost to be the third person. That it was no sinecure appears from several of the entries which follow, e. g. that of Oct. 17, and also from certain jottings, not formally a part of the Minutes, made for Frost's guidance at the end of one of the Scroll Minute Books. These jottings consist of an abstract of the New Act, with its penalties on author, printer, and seller respectively, and of the names and addresses of two culprits, connected with the journal called *Perfect Occurrences,* to whom Frost meant at once to apply the Act, in this fashion: "(1) Send "two or three of the messengers, who may buy at these two "places, and so be able to give evidence; (2) then draw out "a warrant for some to apprehend these persons, and to bring "them before some Justice of the Peace." In fact, Frost had a double duty with newspapers. He had to suppress, or try to suppress, all not licensed by himself, Rushworth, or Scobell; and he had to conduct a new one, or see it conducted, on his own account. This was a *A Briefe Relation of Some Affaires and Transactions, Civill and Military, both Forraigne and Domestique*, published weekly by Matthew Simmons. The fact did not escape comment by the journalists he had to keep in order. "This is a remarkable piece of tyranny and usurpation in Squire Frost," says the *Mercurius Elencticus* of Oct. 29—Nov. 5, "to monopolise the whole benefit of public lying and cheating"; and it proceeds to point out that Matthew Simmons, "the Council of State's factotum," had already at that date broken the new Press Act five times, and so incurred a penalty of £50, by having brought out five numbers of Frost's own newspaper without Frost's or his own address.[1]

---

[1] Cunningham's London, Art. *Whitehall*; Council Order Books; Phillips's Memoir of Milton, p. xxxiii.

Milton's work for the Council was higher and more select than Frost's, but still rather miscellaneous.

In the first place, he could not avoid his share in that squalid, but perhaps necessary, business of looking after seditious authors, and poor wretches of printers and booksellers, which still occupied so much of the Council's attention. Actual quest of these culprits, with their arrest and examination, belonged to the Council itself, or its Committees, with Frost, the Serjeant-at-arms, and minor bull-dogs to assist; licensing also was fortunately Frost's duty; but now and then, we have seen, Milton's services were still required in examining suspected papers and reporting on them. He had done this duty already, with some effect, in Marchamont Needham's case; but even more important was the task given him (Oct. 24) of examining, with the Serjeant-at-arms, the papers of Mr. Clement Walker after that gentleman's arrest. The task may not have been without its amusement, for Walker's papers must have been a lively medley, and Milton may even have come upon references to himself among them, in addition to one printed in that *Anarchia Anglicana* or *Second Part of the History of Independency* which had occasioned the crash. "There is lately come forth," Walker had there written of Milton's *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, "a book of JOHN MELTON'S (a libertine that "thinketh his wife a manacle, and his very garters to be "shackles and fetters to him; one that, after the Independent "fashion, will be tied by no obligation to God or Man), "wherein he undertaketh to prove," &c.; and so through a whole paragraph, replying to Milton in a tirade which includes Cromwell and the Council of State, Antimonarchists, Anarchists, Anabaptists, Brownists, Barrowists, Adamites, Familists, Libertines, and all successors of John of Leyden and older heretics. What was to become of Clement Walker, on account of either his printed book or his papers, Milton himself could not tell, and probably did not care to speculate. Whenever he could, however, he did use his influence in favour of such offending pamphleteers and their printers as could be brought to reason. Anthony Wood attributes Needham's release and reconciliation with the existing powers to Lenthall, who knew his family, and to Bradshaw; but there can be little doubt, from the sequel, that Milton had interested himself in the versatile wit's behalf, and even visited him in Newgate to talk him into a better mind. There is a shade of likelihood that he had befriended Royston, and we shall see what he did in the case of Dugard.[1]

---

[1] Council Order Books (especially jottings at the end of Scroll Order Book No. 31); Frost's *Brief Relation*, No. 7; and *Mercurius Elencticus*, No. 27. In *Brief Relation* No. 7 (i. e. for Nov. 6, 1649) there is this curious news from Paris: "There is newly come "out in print here a French book, the "title of which is *Memories of Charles "the First, King of Great Britain, written "with his own hand during his imprison-"ment*, whereby it appeareth that the "book entitled *The Royal Portrait* [*Ei-"kon Basilike*] is falsely fathered upon "him." The writer goes on to say that the Protestant Royalist refugees were greatly disturbed by this rival to the *Eikon Basilike*, the rather because its nominal author was one Mercier, who had been employed by Lord Jermyn as French tutor to the Prince of Wales and the Duke of York. They therefore suspected that Queen Henrietta Maria and Jermyn had brought out the new book to counteract the effects on the Roman Catholics of the more strongly Protestant passages of the *Eikon*. "Con-"cerning that revered idol, the book "fostered upon the late King, to which "there hath been such idolatrous vene-"ration given, the world," says the writer, "will be shortly informed whose "brat it was, or at least that it was "not his; and so these idolaters will "find that they have worshipped the "painter's mistress for Our Lady." Milton must have read this in print in the Council Office the day it appeared, if not in Frost's MS. before.

Naturally any work for the Council of a literary kind was regarded as in Mr. Milton's department. Hence perhaps some superintendence by him of Mr. Hall's Reply to Prynne; and hence, at all events, his commission to negotiate among the booksellers for the proper printing of Mr. Thomas Waring's Book about the Irish Massacre. Hence, too, his virtual instalment, by the orders of July 16, 1649 and Feb. 2, 1649–50, in the chief charge of the State-Paper Office in Whitehall. The letters directed, by the second order, to be sent to Messrs. Baker, Challoner, Weckherlin, and Willingham, requiring them to deliver over to Milton all State-papers in their possession, were actually sent, in this form :—

---

[1] Council Order Books; Walker's *Independency, Part II.* (edit. 1649) pp. 196—197; Wood's Ath. III. 1181.

"Sir,—We are informed that there are several letters and other papers of public concernment that are in your hands, which we have thought fit should be brought into the Paper Office at Whitehall, both for the safe keeping of them, and that they might be ready for public use upon all occasions. We therefore desire you to deliver all the said papers to Mr. Milton, whom we have appointed to receive the same, and see them safely and orderly disposed in the said office. Signed in the name and by the order of the Council of State,

Jo. Bradshawe, President.[1]

Whitehall, 4 Feb., 1649–50."

Hearing of these multifarious duties of Milton, his good friends, the Royalist Journalists outside, thought him no less a monopolizer than Frost, and asked why the Council did not make Milton also Master of the new Probate-Court which it was proposed to erect for the Commonwealth. "It is the "State's policy," says Needham's successor in the *Mercurius Pragmaticus*, in the number for Jan. 22–29, "to smother their "sorrows by a bustle and pretence for settling laws and Courts "for administration of justice in divers cases, as wills, administrations, legacies, marriages, and divorces: sure, when such "a Court is erected, these Regicides will choose Mr. Milton "(who holds forth the Doctrine of Divorce, and, like a State "Champion, shamed himself with handling his pen to oppose "those divine meditations of our late King of happy memory) "to be judge; and then, be sure, the Juncto's wills must be "obeyed." This is the same number of *Pragmaticus* in which the death of the Earl of Pembroke is recorded with such glee and his character given in metre, as already quoted (ante p. 127). Cromwell is also abused, as always, both in prose and in verse. The "sorrows" which the Masters of the Commonwealth were supposed to be "smothering" by talk about a new Court of Probate, were, in fact, those occasioned by a rumoured defeat of Cromwell in Ireland; and the rumour is embalmed in a savoury set of stanzas, of which this is one:—

---

[1] Hamilton's *Milton Papers* (Camden Society) p. 47. The particular letter there given, from the State Paper Office, is that to Mr. Willingham.

> "Yes, yes! he flies! His flaming nose
> Cannot dry up the bogs;
> His friends stick there, and, faith! his foes
> Bait him to death with dogs."[1]

In the proper work of his Latin Secretaryship Milton, all this while, had still very little to do. Besides that letter to the Governor of Tetuan, however, noted under date Jan. 29, 1649–50, and of which I have no trace, he did, in this last half of the First year of the Commonwealth, write at least five Latin dispatches. They are the first five in his preserved series of the *Literæ Senatus Anglicani*, or "Letters of the English Parliament," published after his death, and his own copies of which are now in the State Paper Office. They were as follows:[2]—

---

[1] *Merc. Prag.*, as cited.

[2] As I here begin to edit historically, for the first time, Milton's Latin Letters of State (so far as that may be done in abstract, with elucidations and occasional translations), it may be well to give some account of the originals, and of the mode in which they have been transmitted to us:—Milton himself carefully kept copies of his official Latin letters, or at least of all that he considered important; and there is evidence that he would have published the collection of them in the last year of his life, in company with his *Epistolæ Familiares*, if the Government of Charles II. would have suffered the publication (see Vol. I. p. 239). As that could not be, he left a transcript of them, at his death in 1674, in charge of the last of his amanuenses, a certain young Mr. Daniel Skinner, of Trinity College, Cambridge, with instructions to have them, and also his MS. treatise *De Doctrinâ Christianâ*, published abroad, if possible. Both the packets of manuscript were accordingly conveyed by Skinner to Amsterdam, and placed in the hands of the printer Daniel Elzevir. In consequence of remonstrances from the English Government, however, the publication was stopped; and the two packets, having been sent back to London by Elzevir in 1677, were surrendered by Skinner to Sir Joseph Williamson, the English Secretary of State. Meanwhile, in 1676, there had been printed in London, in a small duodecimo volume, an unauthorized edition of the Latin State Letters, under the title, *Literæ Pseudo-Senatus Anglicani, necnon Cromwellii, Reliquorumque Perduellium, nomine et jussu conscriptæ a Joanne Miltono.* This edition, according to Daniel Skinner, was an "imperfect" one, put to the press very carelessly by a London bookseller, named Pitts, of St. Paul's Churchyard, who had bought copies of the Letters from "a poor fellow that had formerly surreptitiously got them from Milton." Anyhow the copies, so far as they went, were authentic enough; and this PRINTED COLLECTION OF MILTON'S STATE LETTERS—either in that careless first edition of 1676, or in a better edition by Pritz at Leipsic in 1690, or in Phillips's English translation, published at London in 1694—is the form in which the Letters have all along been generally known, and in which they have been hitherto always reprinted in editions of Milton's Whole Works (e.g. Pickering's of 1851). Fortunately, however, the MS. transcript which Milton left in Skinner's hands has been preserved. In 1823 Mr. Robert Lemon, Deputy Keeper of the State Papers, found a brown paper parcel lying in one of the presses of the old State Paper Office at Whitehall; and this brown paper parcel turned out to be the actual package, containing Mil-

(I.) To the Senate of Hamburg, *Aug.* 10, 1649:—Milton's previous letter, of the 2nd of April, to the authorities of the great German city, had, as we have seen (ante pp. 89, 90), not been delivered by Mr. Isaac Lee, the English agent. Mr. Lee, however, had been negotiating, in some way or other, with the Hamburg authorities; and the result had been one communication from them, of date June 25, addressed directly to the English Parliament. In form it was very respectful; for the Commons Journals of Aug. 3, on which day it was read in Parliament, expressly note its superscription, as a satisfactory sign at last from one foreign power: "*Illustrissimis, Excellentissimis, Nobilissimis, ac Magnificis Dominis, Dominis Celsissimæ Domus Parliamenti in Anglia Ordinibus, Dominis nostris observandissimis.*" Nevertheless it contained a complaint of certain frauds or other mal-practices of the English merchants dealing with Hamburg, and chiefly of the traders in woollen goods. This complaint the House referred to the Committee for the Navy,

---

ton's Latin State Letters and his Latin Treatise of Christian Doctrine, which Elzevir had sent back from Amsterdam in 1677. It had lain as lumber in the State Paper Office for nearly a century and a half. In 1825 the Latin Treatise of Christian Doctrine, so recovered, was given to the world by Dr. C. Sumner, afterwards Bishop of Winchester, by command of George IV.; but, as there were already printed editions of the State Letters, no such trouble was taken with the recovered MS. of *them.* That MS., accordingly, still remains unedited in the Record Office. It is a very neat, elegantly written thin quarto, in the hand of Daniel Skinner, who seems to have made the transcript from Milton's copies while Milton was yet alive, and by his direction. Heading the series of Letters belonging to the Commonwealth Period is the title in Skinner's hand, *Epistolæ Johannis Miltonii, Angli, pro Parlamento Anglicano Interregni Tempore scriptæ*; and heading the series written through the Protectorate is the title, *Johannis Miltoni, Angli, Epistolarum Liber Secundus, quæ Oliverii Protectoris nomine scriptæ sunt.* The MS., as a whole, may be distinguished from the Printed Collection by the name of the Skinner Transcript.—The Skinner Transcript contains *fourteen* State Letters, some of them important, which are not contained in the Printed Collection. These have been printed by themselves in Mr. W. Douglas Hamilton's *Milton Papers* (Camden Society, 1859). On the other hand, the Printed Collection contains *eleven* letters and *two* relative documents not contained in the Skinner Transcript. There is no reason to doubt the authenticity of these, as they had been derived originally from Milton himself. A good many of the Letters undated or only vaguely dated in the Printed Collection are dated exactly in the Skinner Transcript; the order of the Letters in the latter (where they are numbered) is more correct on the whole than in the former (where they are *not* numbered); and there are occasional minute differences in the texts.—For the purposes of these volumes I have had before me the Latin Printed Collection as given in Pickering's edition of Milton's Works, and also Phillips's English Translation of the same in his volume of 1694; but I have examined the Skinner Transcript, and have taken notes of datings and other additions and corrections furnished by it. My inventory of Milton's State Letters will therefore, I hope, be the most complete and exact yet made. A good deal remained for me to do. The order of the Letters, dreadfully jumbled sometimes in the Printed Collection, is by no means perfect even in the Skinner Transcript, and I have had to ascertain the dates of not a few, as well as I could, by references to the *Commons Journals, Thurloe,* &c., or by study of the subject-matter. As I believe I have succeeded in reducing them at last to chronological order, I have, in order to make my inventory as useful as possible, adopted the plan of numbering the entire series afresh by means of Roman figures within parentheses. For the rest, wherever the Latin Printed Collection differs materially from the Skinner Transcript, or either from the Phillips Translation, the fact will be mentioned in a footnote.

but the answer to the letter they referred to the Council of State. Hence the new Milton Dispatch to the Hamburgers. It is addressed, "*Senatus Populusque Anglicanus Amplissimo Civitatis Hamburgensis Senatui salutem,*" and is dated, "*Westmonasterio, Dat. Aug.* 10, 1649." Referring to the letter of the Senate and Burgomasters, it explains that the matter of their complaint has been remitted to persons well qualified, who will "make a more "strict inquiry into the frauds of the clothiers and other artificers "of the woollen manufacture"; but then it reminds the Hamburgers that they also, by all law and equity, owe something to the Commonwealth. In language which implies that Milton did not yet know that his former letter had not been delivered, he then goes on to repeat the demand of that letter for justice and protection to English merchants. There had been several outrages of late at Hamburg, worse than ever, especially since the Scottish refugee, Cochrane, had come to the city, pretending some embassy or other from the son of the late King ("mandatam jam sibi a Carolo, defuncti nuper Regis filio, legationem nescio quam prædicat"). There had been threats, swords drawn, and other ruffianly acts, including the capture of some English merchants and their detention on board a privateer. The Parliament therefore desires the punishment and expulsion of this Cochrane and his accomplices, and efficient future protection of the English merchants. Surely, so respectable a State, bound to England by such ancient relations, will "not think that beaten and exiled Tarquins are to be preferred "to the friendship and wealth of the English People."

(II.) To THE SENATE OF HAMBURG, *Jan.* 4, 1649-50:—The last letter had produced some effect, and the Hamburgers had been more friendly of late. Meanwhile, one piece of news to the contrary had been received in England. The Hamburgers were preventing the English merchants in the city from obeying the order that all subjects of the Commonwealth, abroad as well as at home, should take the Engagement of Allegiance (ante p. 124). Milton in his present letter, therefore, explains the necessity of such an Engagement, now that the Commonwealth was established and all opposition put down, and trusts that the Hamburgers will not persist in a punctilio which even the United Provinces of Holland have not felt or mentioned. Of course, it is the "vagabond Scots" that are the cause; but let the Senate and Burgomasters govern their own city.

(III & IV.) To PHILIP IV., KING OF SPAIN, *Feb.* 4, 1649-50:—There are two letters, of this date, to his Spanish Majesty, both addressed, "*Serenissimo et Potentissimo Principi, Philippo Quarto, Hispaniarum Regi.*" (1) The first and shorter is a credential letter for ANTHONY ASCHAM, who had just been appointed agent for the Commonwealth at Madrid (ante p. 126). It introduces Ascham to the Spanish King as "a person of integrity, learned, and "descended of a distinguished family," and it begs his Majesty to grant him safe conduct to and from Madrid, and a favourable reception, or at least, should his Majesty be otherwise inclined, speedy information to that effect. (2) The second letter is to the same purport on the whole, but a little fuller, and seems to be the letter which Ascham was to deliver in case the first had so far succeeded as to procure him access. It assumes that his Majesty is sufficiently acquainted with the political change which has occurred in England and the reasons for it, so that the Commonwealth need not doubt of the goodwill of the Spanish Court, in spite of the calumnies of exiles and fugitives (Hyde and Cottington indicated, but not named); and it hopes for intimation, through Mr. Ascham, of his Majesty's sentiments as to articles of commercial alliance between the two nations.

(V.) To JOHN IV, KING OF PORTUGAL, *Feb.* 4, 1649-50:—The letter to this sovereign is addressed, "*Serenissimo Principi, Joanni Quarto, Lusitaniæ Regi*"; and the omission of "*Potentissimo*" here indicates a disposition to be truthful and moderate even in the language of diplomatic politeness. The King is informed that the English Commonwealth is very anxious to be on good terms with foreign nations, and especially with Portugal, between which and England there is so great a trade, profitable to both. All will be in vain, however, "if, as is reported, pirates "and deserters" from England are suffered to have refuge in the Portuguese harbours, and, "after having taken and plundered "English vessels," to sell the goods by public auction in the very streets of Lisbon. Rupert and his fleet are here meant, but are not named. The Commonwealth has sent a most noble person, MR. CHARLES VANE, to his Portuguese Majesty, with full powers and instructions, and trusts to his good reception and honourable treatment.[1]

In Milton, it is clear, the Commonwealth had obtained a Latin secretary who could maintain its dignity by sufficient stateliness of expression, while conveying its messages with precision and force. The last three of these missives were about his final acts in the first year of his appointment; and, doubtless, his expected ANSWER TO SALMASIUS, ordered on Jan. 8, was already occupying his mind. This is the place, accordingly, for some account of Salmasius and his Book against the English Commonwealth.

---

[1] In these abstracts I have sometimes taken a phrase from Phillips's English Translation, which is, on the whole, not bad. Phillips, in his Preface, calls it "good Latin made good English."

SALMASIUS AND HIS DEFENSIO REGIA.

Claude de Saumaise, called generally Claudius Salmasius, was one of the most celebrated men in Europe. Born in 1588, near Sémur in the East of France, and educated first at home, and then in Paris and at Heidelberg, he had been a prodigy of learning from his boyhood. At Heidelberg, where he had abjured his paternal religion of Roman Catholicism, he had signalized both his change of creed and his precocious erudition by his first publication. It was entitled *Nilus et Barlaamus de Primatu Papæ*, and consisted of an edition, with a Latin version and notes, of certain Greek discourses on the Primacy of the Pope by Nilus Cabasilas, an Archbishop of the fourteenth century, and Barlaam, a monk of the same period. It appeared in 1608, the year of Milton's birth, and was followed, in 1609, by *Florus cum Commentariis*, an edition of the compendium of Roman History by Annæus Florus. After three years of student-life at Heidelberg, he had returned to his native France in 1610; and there, domiciled for some time with his parents in Burgundy, but latterly in the neighbourhood of Paris, where he married (1623) a somewhat distinguished wife, named Anne Mercier, he had lived till 1631, engaged incessantly in research and authorship. *Epistola de Regionibus et Ecclesiis Suburbicariis* (1619), *Notæ in Historiæ Augustæ Scriptores* (1620), *Notæ in Tertullianum de Pallio* (1622), are the titles of some of the writings of this portion of his life. His master-work, however, was a vast folio, published at Paris in 1629, with the title *Cl. Salmasii Plinianæ Exercitationes in Caii Julii Solini Polyhistora*: i. e. "Plinian Exercitations of Claudius Salmasius on the Polyhistor of Caius Julius Solinus." Solinus was a Latin writer of the third century or thereabouts, whose *Polyhistor* has been described, with admirable compactness, thus: "A geographical "compendium, divided into fifty-seven chapters, containing "a brief sketch of the world as known to the Ancients, diver-"sified by historical notices, remarks on the origin, habits, "religious rites, and social condition, of various nations enu-

"merated, together with details regarding the remarkable "productions of each region, whether animal, vegetable, or "mineral." One can see how such a book, a great favourite in the Middle Ages, should have suited the purpose of Salmasius. Taking the *Polyhistor* of Solinus, chapter by chapter, he could, in the form of comment and illustration, pour out all his own vast stores of miscellaneous and minute information, without the trouble of being too systematic. This, accordingly, is what he did. There are, first, *Prolegomena in Solinum;* then there is the text of the *Polyhistor* itself; but the bulk of the book, in about eight hundred folio pages of double columns, consists of his own *Plinianæ Exercitationes*, or Latin notes and comments on Solinus. They are called "Plinian" with reference to the fact that the matter of Solinus was mainly an unacknowledged digest from the Natural History of Pliny; and they form a huge Encyclopædia of philological and antiquarian lore. Even in that age of diffused erudition, when the Scholar, and not the Poet, the Orator, or the Thinker, was honoured everywhere as the top of men, and the Scholar indeed was supposed to include the Thinker, the feat of Salmasius in his *Exercitationes in Solinum* was regarded as marvellous. What ought not France to do for such an illustrious son? Other nations, however, competed for possession of him. Venice wanted him; Oxford wanted him; the Dutch wanted him; the very Pope wanted him. At length, freedom of opinion and action being one of his motives for a change, he had declared in favour of the Dutch. One of his reasons, says his biographer, for preferring the United Provinces to England was his belief that "there is always greater liberty in a Republic than in a Kingdom." In 1631, accordingly, he had settled in Leyden, with a public salary, not in an ordinary Professorship in the famous University of that city, but in an extraordinary capacity which gave him precedence in University meetings; and here, notwithstanding splendid offers by Richelieu and Mazarin, intended to lure him back to France, he had resided ever since, with the exception of an allowed absence in 1640–43, spent chiefly in Paris. Book after book, to the number of about thirty altogether, most of them from the press of Elzevir at Leyden, had, in the course of those eighteen years, been added to his former works. *De Usuris* (1638), *De Modo Usurarum* (1639), *Commentarius in Epictetum et Simplicium* (1640), *Tabula Cebetis cum Prolegomenis* (1640), *Dissertatio de Episcopis et Presbyteris, contra D. Petavium* (1641), *De Lingua Hellenistica et Origine ac Dialectis Græcæ Linguæ* (1643), *Observationes ad Jus Atticum et Romanum* (1645), *Apparatus De Primatu Papæ*, a reissue and extension of his earliest work on the same subject (1645), *De Transsubstantione, contra H. Grotium* (1646), *De Annis Climactericis et Antiqua Astrologia Diatribæ* (1648): such are the titles of some of these latest publications of the great Salmasius. That name, in fact, is too weak to convey an idea of the prodigious European reputation of the feeble-bodied little Frenchman, as he walked about in Leyden in 1649, sixty years of age, and subject, as he used to tell people, to more pains of headache, toothache, and gout, and more fevers and illnesses of every possible sort, than had ever fallen to the lot of any other man. Richelieu had said that there were but three consummate scholars of the age, Grotius, Bignonius, and Salmasius; and Mazarin, when he could not persuade Salmasius to return to France, had sent him the order of Knighthood and other honours, in proof of his Most Christian Majesty's desire, nevertheless, to decorate him as a Frenchman. "A man not in my "opinion only, but by the common consent of Scholars, the "most learned of all who are now living," the Italian Balthazarus Bonifacius had written of Salmasius; and Thomas Bartholinus had called him "the miracle of the world, the most learned of mortals." And so universally, in France, Italy, Germany, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Great Britain, wherever learning was known, as might be proved, we are told, by concurring testimonies from "the Scaligers, the "Casaubons, the Jungermanns, the Gaulmini, the Peirescs, "the Scriverii, the Berneggeri, the Freinsheims, the Reinezii, "the Rhodii, the Crucii, the Maussaci, the Gronovii, the "Gruters, the Balzacs, the Ferrarii, the Grotii, the Seldens, "the Vossii, the Gatakers, the Riveti, the Spanheims, the "Voetii, the Dematii, the Ushers, the Beverovicii, the Bo-

"charts, and others nearly numberless." This is perhaps too tremendous; and one comes upon contemporary criticisms of Salmasius which show that he had his detractors, like other people, and that even his admirers were not always in the admiring vein. Substantially, however, it was as the eulogies represent. There he sat at Leyden, the author of the Commentary on Solinus, and the paragon of European scholarship. There is a portrait of him, engraved by John Maire of Leyden in 1641, which is far more elaborate artistically than any portrait ever executed of the living Milton. In this portrait, underneath the sulky, pain-grooved face, and the frilled and mantled shoulders, there are eight lines of Latin verse by the Dutch scholar Caspar Barlæus. Paris, they tell the reader, had once had the original of that effigy; but now he adorned Leyden. What immensity of intellect under that forehead! Writers might write on, and do their best; but the *non plus ultra* of the world of writing had been reached by the Commentator on Solinus![1]

A man like Salmasius had, of course, been much consulted in the controversies of his time. "As if on him alone," says his biographer, "the recognised oracle as he was of the "vastest knowledge among mortals, there had hung the ad-"judication of every question of right and wrong, there flocked "to him from all quarters, as to a sure defence, men of every "rank and nation, with their doubts and difficulties." Since the beginning of the Civil Wars in Scotland and England his advice had been frequently asked on the ecclesiastical differences underlying those wars. An enemy long ago to the Papacy, and even to the theory of Episcopacy by divine right, he had been at first favourable to the cause of the Scottish Covenanters and the English Parliamentarians; and much use had been made by them of his treatise *De Episcopis et Presbyteris*, published in 1641, and of his *De Primatu Papæ* of 1645. Latterly, however, he had tended to the opinion that a Limited Episcopacy, somewhat after Usher's model, would be best for England. This had been a disappointment to the

---

[1] *De Laudibus et Vita Cl. Salmasii*, by Antonius Clementius, prefixed to a collection of the *Epistolæ* of Salmasius, published at Leyden in 1656.

English and Scottish Presbyterians; but they were pleased to know at least that Salmasius agreed with them in their abhorrence of Independency and the Sects. Letters had been sent to him from the Scottish statesmen, signed by Chancellor Loudoun, begging him to come forward in some public way against those schismatics; and he had been engaged in an express study of Independency and the English Church Controversy when Charles was brought to the scaffold. The hope then among the Presbyterians in England and Scotland was that Salmasius, with other foreign scholars, would speak out against the Republic and in behalf of the succession of Charles II.[1]

To Charles himself at the Hague there had been represented the propriety of attaching to his cause such a European celebrity as Salmasius. It may have been done by the Prince-Stadtholder, who frequently called the Leyden sage "into his counsels on political and military matters," or by the ex-queen of Bohemia, who was on very familiar terms with him, and "often took his advice in her heaviest difficulties." Somehow, at all events, Charles had concluded that to get a book from Salmasius against the Commonwealth would be immensely to his advantage. There was the necessary negotiation, and Salmasius consented. By Nov. 1649, at latest, as we have seen, when the Commonwealth was not ten months old, the *Defensio Regia pro Carolo I.*, dedicated to Charles II., was out on the Continent, and ready for importation into England. It had been printed by Elzevir at the young King's expense; and, low as was the royal exile's exchequer, a sum of one hundred Jacobuses, or twenty-shilling pieces, was mustered as a fee for the author. His name did not appear on the title-page; but, as it was half the battle that it should be known everywhere that the book was by Salmasius, no secret was made of the fact.[2]

As the spirit of the whole book is conveyed in the "Preface," the beginning and the essential portions of the eighteen pages printed with that title may be here translated:—

---

[1] *Vita Cl. Salmasii* by Clementius, xlviii—li; Baillie, III. 66—67.

[2] *Vita Salmasii,* p. xlviii; Milton's Preface to his Answer to Salmasius.

"The horrible news recently smote our ears with dreadful wound, but our minds more, of the parricide committed among the English in the person of their King (*in persona Regis*) by a nefarious conspiracy of sacrilegious men. Whomsoever the hideous rumour reached, on the instant, as if they had been blasted by a lightning-stroke, *arrectæque horrore comæ et vox faucibus hæsit.* The softer-natured could not restrain their tears nor refrain from sobbing. Those who were stronger-minded burnt with such a flame of indignation that they were hardly masters of themselves. No one but uttered heavy imprecations on the authors of a crime so great, so unheard of, and so unusual. For, as what is unexpected strikes most, so, when a thing so new had come upon people suddenly, no one was found so savage, so iron-hearted, so bereft of all sense of humanity, or void of respect for Kingly majesty, as not to have excited in his breast private sorrow, in combination with the public grief, over the miserable and marvellous murder of so sacred a life. It must indeed be confessed that, since the name of Royalty for the government of peoples was born and known in the world, even to these present times, through the whole intermediate flow of ages, no one had seen or heard of an action like this. It is truly of such a sort that it ought to be mentioned among the disgraces of the century, to be reckoned yet among the portents of the past, unless our history shall so lose credibility with posterity that they shall hardly believe that any such thing happened in this generation. Verily it is for the interests of times to come that what we cannot deny did actually occur should be regarded as a fable . . . . Wherefore, as the deed which we have heard of as done in England is without example, the less is it to be pardoned, the more is it to be execrated, and the more earnest care is to be taken lest it spread its influence in this very time and become a precedent drawing disaster into the age that is coming. Worthy then of the hatred and invectives of all are those who did it, and most worthy moreover to be pursued with fire and sword, not only by all kings and princes in Europe ruling by royal right, but also by all magistrates and all rightly-constituted and rightly-principled Republics. For this faction of fanatics not only delights in assaulting the thrones of Kings, but endeavours to subvert all powers that itself has not made, desiring and aiming at nothing else than a change of whatever exists, not only in the State, but also in the Church, with such an endless lust of farther innovation as may secure for itself the licence of governing all and obeying none. . . . . That not only the subversion of the kingdom, but also the uprooting of the laws, is their intention, they sufficiently prove. For by no other way could they remove their lawful King than by the abrogation of all the laws by which that Kingdom had been founded. But let no one mistake. It was not in their mind or wish to establish a Popular Government instead of the Kingly rule. The fact shows what they did wish. For one King they have set up Forty Tyrants. . . . . If they had thought only how the constitution might be changed for the better, it ought to have been enough for them, when they had taken away the King and abolished the Kingly government, to leave the State otherwise as it was, and allow the chief power to remain with the Parliament, the authority of which was always next to the King's. Without any other change, this would have been a popular platform. Had they wished only a Democracy, a better could not have been constituted than out of the three estates of which that Parliament was composed. Did it not consist of the Bishops, representing the Church, the Peers, representing the Nobility, and the Deputies of Cities, representing the Commons? But they voted that the Ecclesiastical order, chiefly embodied in the Bishops, should not only be ejected from the Senate, but also wholly thrown off. I will not say at this time of day with what design and in what spirit, or how rightly, they did that. I omit also any mention of the antiquity of those Bishops, or of the original and main purpose of the institution of their office, namely the removal of schisms. I will not add that they were kept in the English Reformation itself. But that even after that they must have seemed necessary, and that their retention was on the whole desirable, even by the admission of many Presbyterians themselves, appears from the fact that so long as there was an Episcopacy there was no sprouting of a thousand pestiferous sects in England, with that ugliest of all in the midst of them which rejoices in the name of Brownists and Independents. *They* are the men who chased out of Parliament first the Bishops and then the Peers, and presently afterwards deprived their sovereign of his realm and his life. . . . Such being these fanatical scoundrels in religion, in conversation, in the administration of affairs, who will not declare them the public enemies of their country? That is saying little: they are to be condemned as the common enemies of the human race. Should you regard them as hostile and fatal only to the Kings whom they think it sport most iniquitously to kill? There is no magistracy in the Christian world, no power on earth, however ordinary, however ordained of God, as it is agreed that all that exist are by the very fact of their existence, which they do not pursue and are not prepared to pursue with like hatred, which they do not desire by all means to see equally exterminated, because everywhere among them is the same unbridled passion for commanding, the same obstinate inaptitude for obeying. Thence they have their name of *Independents.* As the Schools of Philosophers have taken their name from some principal dogma of their teaching, the Sceptics because they doubt, the Dogmatics because they affirm, the Critics because they judge, so they, because they have for the chief axiom of their abominable sect the resolution to be subject to no magistrates, no kings, no laws, have affected the appellation of *Independency*. . . . . Why then hesitate kings, if they would be uninjured, if they would be secure, if they would be safe, to run together and fly together from the whole world, and meet in one, so as with their joint forces and resources to fit out an armament for the extermination of those pests of Kingdoms and Commonwealths? They are the fellows who use Kings' heads for balls, play with crowns as with spinning tops, make no more of imperial sceptres than if they were clown's staves with knobs to them, and regard the official robes of chief magistrates as viler than filthy and torn rags. Surely the blood of the great King of Great Britain, shed by the huge wickedness of his enemies, calls to its revenge all monarchs and princes of the Christian world. Nor can they appease his spirit more worthily than by restoring to his full rights the legitimate heir and successor of the blessed and glorious martyr, and reseating him on his paternal throne, sacrificing to the infernal gods, and slaying as victims at the tomb of the saintly dead, those most outrageous beasts who conspired for the murder of so great a King, daring so cruel an iniquity and enjoying their success. . . . . A cause so good and just ought not to be adorned with rhetorical colourings; enough that it be clearly set forth. For simply to narrate the thing as it happened is to defend the King. In which Defence we shall proceed in this order:—First we shall characterize the deed itself as its unworthiness and atrocity deserve. Then we shall treat at length of the question of legal right. After that we shall address ourselves to the particular argument whether any subjects whatever can have a just right to bear arms against their King, bring him to law, accuse, condemn, and capitally punish him. And that will be denied. Thereafter I shall show that the King of Great Britain has supreme power over his subjects, answerable to no other power than God's, and consequently that what has been said in vindication of the rights of any other King from accusation, judgment, and condemnation by his subjects applies with express legal force to the King of England. Finally, when it shall have been proved that by no legal right could he be brought to trial, it will be inquired whether he so lived and reigned that, though there was no legal right of trying him, he yet merited condemnation. And this cause shall be pleaded before the whole world, listening and as it were sitting in judgment, and not merely debated in that conclave of infamous and wicked judges who are well-known to have been appointed by their partners in guilt of the same faction not for the purpose of investigating a charge, but for sentencing an innocent man, and him a King, and their own King. The injustice, the impiety, the perfidy, the cruelty, of these men I will proclaim to Heaven and Earth, and will send on the culprits convicted to posterity, as men proved guilty of an action such that neither have past ages seen the like, nor perhaps shall coming ages see the like either."

The Book itself is a long fulfilment, in twelve chapters, of the programme here vaguely sketched. Chapter I., though professing to be a statement of facts, is very much a repetition of the general invective of the Preface: e. g. "Among the "difficulties which stand in the way of expressing adequately "the hideousness of so incredible a crime, this one observa-"tion suggests itself as easy to make, yet worthy of being "again and again repeated as absolutely true: viz. that the "Sun himself, in the course of his annual round, has never "beheld a more wicked or more atrocious deed." Chapter II. discusses the Rights of Kings by the Old Testament, maintaining the inviolability even of bad kings and tyrants by their subjects and their responsibility to God only; and Chapter III. continues the argument by the New Testament. Chapter IV. inquires into the theory and practice of the Jewish Church and the Primitive Christian Church in the matter; and Chapters V., VI., and VII., pursue the argument through ancient and general History. Not till Chapter VIII. do we arrive more particularly at England. That Chapter and Chapter IX. treat of the history of the English Constitution, the continuity of the Kingly Power, the origin of Parliaments, the relations of the Sovereign to his Parliaments, &c. In Chapter X. we approach the catastrophe through a sketch of the more recent history of England and especially her more recent ecclesiastical history, bringing the Independents darkly to the front. Chapter XI. discusses the forms and circumstances of the actual trial of Charles, fastening the crime on the Independents; and Chapter XII. winds up the book with an inquiry into the character and conduct of the King who had been so foully treated.

The pages of the book throughout are well sprinkled with quotations from Greek and Latin authors, in evidence of the vast learning of Salmasius. For the rest, neither the style nor the thought ever rises above the level of the specimen already given. The Latin itself, though sufficiently fluent, is of a rather poor and hard texture, never masterly, never swelling or growing flexible with the pressure of meaning or feeling, but proceeding by ordinary repetitive tricks of syntax, and attaining the smartness thought desirable by constant recourse to a saucerful of such terms as *latrones*, *carnifices*, *nebulones*, and by occasional stereotyped exclamations and interrogations, such as "*O tempora! O mores! O natio! O Religio! O* "*Reformatio!*" "*Ubi pietas, non dicam Christiana, sed humana?*" "*Fiat, iterum fiat: tuque, Deus, exaudi!*" Of real brain in the writer, as distinct from scholarship and practice in Latin sentence-making, there is little or no evidence. The following additional specimens are as fairly and variously characteristic as any five I could present:—

History of Kingship in England.—"If we go back to the earliest known antiquity, when Cæsar came into that Island, a plurality of kings were in possession of it. Strabo, Book IV., writes of the Britons: *δυναστείαι εἰσὶ παρ' αὐτοῖς.* By which he means that there was a plurality of principalities or little kingships in that Island. When Cæsar invaded the island Cassivelaunus seems to have been among these chiefs; the boundaries of whose Kingdom from the maritime states were marked by the river Thames. And then the rest had entrusted him with the supreme government and the administration of the war. Pomponius Mela says, *Fert Britannia populos, regesque populorum.* Tacitus, of the Britons of his time, says, *Olim regibus parebant; nunc per principes factionibus et studiis trahuntur.* Cæsar, however, *De Bell. Gall.* Book IV., has the phrase *Principum Britanniæ;* these *Principes* being the *Dynastæ* mentioned by Strabo, admitted to have been petty kings, each in possession of some district with regal power, some of a greater, others of a less. Tacitus himself distinguishes the princes from the kings, and the principality from the kingdom, in such a manner as to make the name Imperator applicable to the Prince. Thus, *Hist.* Book I., *a regibus usque ad principes:* i. e. *Cæsares.* Under Nero the King of the Iceni in the same island was Prasutagus; who, on his deathbed, if we take the authority of Tacitus, *Annal.* Book XIV., made Cæsar his heir and his two daughters, *tali obsequio,* says the same author, *ratus regnum et domum suam procul injuria fore. Quod contra venit, adeo ut regnum per centuriones, domus per servos, velut capta vastarentur.* Which words show his kingdom to have been hereditary, as were those of the others by whom Britain was governed. And that is also shown by the words of Tacitus concerning Boadicea, the wife of Prasutagus, whose declaration was *non ut tantis majoribus ortam regnum et opes, verum ut unam e vulgo libertatem amissam se velle ulcisci.* The same Tacitus, in his Life of Agricola, brings before us, a little earlier, *domitas in Britannia gentes, captos reges, et monstratum satis Vespasianum.* He mentions in the same place Cogidunus, a King of Britain, to whom, he writes, the Romans made a gift of certain cities. Then he adds: '*Is ad nostram usque memoriam fidissimus mansit, vetere ac jampridem recepta Populi Romani consuetudine, ut haberet instrumenta servitutis et regni.*' When Domitian was Emperor Arviragus reigned in Britain, as Juvenal testifies:—

> '*et de temone Britanno*
> *Excidit Arviragus.*'

About that time, having been wholly subdued and reduced to the form of a Province, it was subjected to the Emperors. While it was under the Empire it underwent several mutations, and more than one tyrant tried to throw off the yoke of the Roman Emperor: Lollianus, Victorinus, Posthumus, and Terricus, under Gallienus; Bonosus and Proculus, under Aurelian; Carausius under Diocletian. Under the later Emperors it lay open as a prey to very many nations, and experienced the same fate as many other provinces of the Roman Empire. So at length it was seized from the Romans by the Saxons and Angles, and from them by the Danes. Again from the Danes it returned to the Saxons. Finally the Normans took it from the Saxons, under the leadership of William, surnamed the Conqueror; who so subdued it as to make it a kingdom for him and his, who have now governed it for nearly six hundred years." *Chapter VIII.*

NO PARLIAMENT BEFORE THE CONQUEST:—"Under the Kings who reigned in England before William no trace is found of a Parliament. They are wrong who would have it that under King Edgar a Parliament used to be called twice a year, and that there is proof of the fact in his Laws, where, under the heading *De Comitiis*, one reads that the Oppidan meetings are held thrice a year, but that the most celebrated assembly from the whole Satrapy is held twice in each year. But in that chapter the subject is not the Comitia, in the sense of a General Convention of the Kingdom called by the King, but the Convention of any one Province, or County, or Satrapy, which did then by custom meet twice a year. The sequel shows this plainly, for it orders the Bishop of the Diocese and the Senator, i. e. the Alderman, or Count, or Secular Judge, to be present at that sort of Convention, the one to exercise divine, and the other human, rights. *Comitatus Curia*, or *County Court*, this sort of Assembly was commonly called. It was of two kinds. One was properly called by the generic name, and was held every month by the Vice-Count or his deputy; the other was held twice a year, at Easter and Michaelmas. This latter was called in

English *The Thurne,* because it used to meet in rotation in each of the centuries, or groups of a hundred, into which the county was divided. But the Courts of the Centuries, vernacularly called *The Hundreds,* having been abolished, the meetings, from the time of Edward III., were held in the chief county-town." *Chapter VIII.*

ENGLISH PURITANISM AND ITS SUBDIVISIONS UNDER ELIZABETH AND JAMES.—" It is time to explain whence and when there burst forth a sect hostile to Kings and impatient of all Government. Those pretty PURITANS, as they were then called, began, in the reign of Elizabeth, to come forth from the darkness of Orcus, and first to disturb the Church. Next, of course, the State. For they are not less pests to the State than to the Church. There were three sorts of them: those who separated themselves entirely from the Church of England; those who did not wholly separate themselves; and those who, though they did not approve of the existing state of the Church, yet accommodated themselves to it. The last were the best of a bad lot; the first the worst. I am ashamed to repeat the names by which they were called, formidable in their very sound: *Separatists, Nonconformists,* and *Conformists.* Much against my will I have set down these luminous appellations. The Separatist folk were, moreover, divided into two classes, a stricter and a laxer, called respectively, after the names of their founders, *Brownists* and *Robinsonians.* The name of INDEPENDENTS had not yet been ventilated." *Chapter X.*

THE INDEPENDENTS AND THEIR PRINCIPLES :—" Our discourse must now be of this kind of cattle, whence they came, what their way, what their discipline, if indeed words can suffice for the description, when under the one name of INDEPENDENTS there lurks a medley of names and kinds of Sects, Heresies, and Schisms, all sheltered by the dark and spreading shade of saintly Independency. For all who agree in this, that they reject both ecclesiastical and civil magistracy, love that name, and are associated as confederates by this one bond of union, however much they may differ in other things. And no wonder. All denominations that dread public supervision, and know that they cannot be tolerated by the magistrate, conspire naturally for the repudiation of all magistracy, foreseeing therefrom nothing better or milder than their own destruction. The same cause made them persecute the Bishops with a hatred quite Vatinian, and declare everlasting war against them, inasmuch as they knew that under the Episcopal rule they could not continue to exist. This sect, therefore, which wants liberty to be given to all sects, schismatic as well as heretical, glories in the title of THE INDEPENDENTS. I do not stop to make two families of them and distribute the wretched folk into the *Orthodox* and the *Fanatics.* Shall they be Orthodox to me who treat the Fanatics as their own people, not only tolerating them, but cherishing them as bosom friends?

Whoever permits heresy perpetrates it. For what does it matter, I ask, whether one walks amiss in the doctrine of the faith or gives free scope to the wolves who are perverting the ways of God and depopulating the fold of Christ? . . . . Those truly cannot be called Orthodox who desire impunity for so many who have lapsed from rule, so many blasphemers, so many atheists, to whom also they concede the power of freely emitting their blasphemies, opposing Christianity, denying God himself. Only the other day the King of the Independents, the Tyrant of England, the enemy and parricide of his King [i. e. Cromwell], when he was setting out with his army from England to Ireland, would not let sail be set till, through a partner in his rebellion and accomplice in the parricide, he had caused public and free profession of their irreligion to be granted by Edict of Parliament to all the sects and heresies and schisms with which Britain now swarms. The Prelatists alone are excluded from this liberty, which is conceded to Antinomians, who repudiate the Law and the Prophets, to Arians, to Photinians, to Chiliasts, and a thousand such fanatical oddities." *Chapter X.*

THE REAL REGICIDES.—"Thus was the King of three Kingdoms perfidiously, wickedly, and parricidally beheaded, on judicial sentence, by the executioner, two of the Kingdoms wholly dissenting, and nine-tenths of the third repudiating the act, among whom were the ministers of the Church, all the Presbyterians, all the nobles, and the sounder and larger part of the people. It was the soldiers of the Independents alone, with their officers, inhabitants of the one English Kingdom (for this pestilence of Independency is absent from the other two), and who make hardly a hundredth part of the English people, that, with inexpiable criminality and by a parricide of unutterable violence, deprived the three Kingdoms of their one King, and him of his life, for no other cause than their attachment to a sect in religion which abhors royal government, and detests Kings." *Chapter XI.*

Such was the book which Milton had been unanimously deputed to answer on behalf of the Commonwealth. It was not that it could do much harm at home. There was no English translation of it;[1] and for those who could read the Latin there was nothing very new in the argument. Moreover, the ignorance of English affairs shown in several parts of it must have detracted considerably from its value in the eyes even of Royalists, while the absoluteness of its doctrine of Royal Prerogative, and its apologies for Prelacy, in recantation of all the author's previous utterances on that subject, must have greatly vexed the Presbyterians. It was abroad that there would be the mischief. Even there, and especially in the Dutch Republic where it had been written, there must have been many to whom the slavish doctrine of the book, its advocacy of Absolute Kingship, was positively offensive, and others who would note, with small respect for Salmasius, his wheel of opinion on the Episcopacy question. All in all, however, circulating in Courts and among those predisposed against the English Commonwealth, the book was calculated to increase and intensify the foreign antipathy with which the Commonwealth had to contend. To answer it effectively, therefore, might be no unworthy work for Milton; and he was willing to take all pains. The mere reading of the *Defensio Regia* would furnish him with the first necessary impressions; but deliberation would be useful, and some larger acquaintance with the other writings of the famous man.[1] His *De Primatu Papæ,* we may be sure, and any other of his books in which he had written against Prelacy, would be on Milton's writing table, and doubtless also, if but for an hour's inspection, a copy of the *Exercitationes in Solinum.* In fact, the great Salmasius might expect soon to hear a new opinion about himself and about his writings generally from this English critic. From Jan. 1649–50 onwards, I seem to see Milton's arm stretching itself, at every leisure moment, through the air towards Leyden, the hand moving quietly as if engaged in fingering, with more and more of interest, the cranium of the great Salmasius.

---

[1] There was a contemporary edition in French (*Apologie Royale pour Charles I. par Claude de Saumaize*, Paris, 1650, 12mo.); but I am not aware that to this day there has been any English translation. Lowndes mentions none.

---

[1] Salmasius, it may be mentioned, was not quite a stranger to Milton even before the present book. In the sixth chapter of Book I. of the *Reason of Church Government* (1641—2) there is a complimentary reference to Salmasius. The subject of that chapter was the assertion of moderate Episcopalians that Episcopacy had been originally set up in the Church for the prevention of schisms; and Milton, in his discussion, after arguing that there had been schism in abundance in the Church of Corinth in St. Paul's time and in the next age, and yet that neither St. Paul nor his followers had set up any government there but that of Presbytery, had added, "And the same of other churches, out "of Hermas and divers other the "scholars of the Apostles, by the late "industry of the learned Salmasius "appears." The reference is to the *Dissertatio de Episcopis et Presbyteris* of Salmasius, published in 1641 in reply to the Jesuit Petavius.

CHAPTER III.

ANNALS OF THE COMMONWEALTH : SECOND YEAR.

FEB. 18, 1649–50—FEB. 18, 1650–51.

CHANGES IN THE COMPOSITION OF THE COUNCIL : ENFORCING OF THE ENGAGEMENT : MISCELLANEOUS PROCEEDINGS OF PARLIAMENT AND THE COUNCIL : MEASURES TO PLEASE THE PRESBYTERIANS : THE TREATY OF BREDA BETWEEN CHARLES II. AND THE SCOTS : LANDING OF THE MARQUIS OF MONTROSE IN SCOTLAND : HIS FATE : ARRIVAL OF CHARLES II. IN SCOTLAND AS A COVENANTED KING : RECALL OF CROMWELL FROM IRELAND TO COMMAND IN THE SCOTTISH WAR : HIS RECEPTION IN LONDON, AND APPOINTMENT TO THE GENERALSHIP-IN-CHIEF FOR THE COMMONWEALTH : DECLARATION OF WAR AGAINST THE SCOTS : NEWS OF THE ASSASSINATION OF ASCHAM AT MADRID : RETIREMENT OF FAIRFAX FROM PUBLIC LIFE : CROMWELL'S INVASION OF SCOTLAND : DAVID LESLIE'S STRATEGY ON THE SCOTTISH SIDE : BATTLE OF DUNBAR : CROMWELL IN EDINBURGH, AND MASTER OF THE SOUTH-EAST SCOTTISH LOWLANDS : DIVISION OF THE SCOTS INTO THREE PARTIES : SEVERE TREATMENT OF CHARLES BY THE ARGYLE OR GOVERNMENT PARTY : "THE START," AND ITS CONSEQUENCES : BETTER TREATMENT OF CHARLES : COALITION OF THE GOVERNMENT PARTY AND THE NORTHERN ROYALISTS : *REMONSTRANCE* OF THE WESTERN WHIGS : CROMWELL'S MARCH WESTWARD : LAMBERT'S ACTION AT HAMILTON : ALL SCOTLAND SOUTH OF THE FIRTHS IN POSSESSION OF THE ENGLISH, AND ONLY SCOTLAND NORTH OF THE FIRTHS LEFT TO CHARLES :

HIS CORONATION AT SCONE: AFFAIRS IN ENGLAND: EFFECTS OF THE BATTLE OF DUNBAR ON FOREIGN POWERS: END OF THE SECOND YEAR OF THE COMMONWEALTH, AND ELECTION OF A NEW COUNCIL OF STATE.

ALL of the former Council (ante pp. 12, 13) were in the Council of State for this year, except the Earl of Pembroke, who had died, the Earl of Mulgrave and Lord Grey of Wark, who were set aside as having kept aloof from the last Council, and Sir John Danvers, whose re-election had been negatived by forty votes to thirty-four. The five new members were THOMAS CHALLONER, Esq., JOHN GURDON, Esq., COLONEL HERBERT MORLEY, SIR PETER WENTWORTH, Knt., and LORD HOWARD OF ESCRICK.

At the first meeting of the New Council, Monday, February 18, 1649–50, twenty members being present, and Colonel Purefoy in the Chair, it was agreed that Mr. Serjeant Bradshaw should be President of the Council for the year, with the proviso, as before, that any nine members of Council, even in his absence, should transact business. At the same meeting, Mr. Gualter Frost, sen., having been already re-appointed General Secretary by the Parliament itself, the Council reappointed Milton as Secretary for Foreign Languages, Mr. Dendy as Serjeant-at-Arms, and Gualter Frost, jun., as assistant to his father, each at his former salary. A form of oath of office and secrecy for the Councillors and their *employés* was then agreed upon; which, having been sanctioned by Parliament, was duly imposed on all concerned in the course of the next meeting or two. At the meeting of the 8th of March Peter Sterry was re-appointed one of the preachers to the Council, and Mr. Owen, who had returned from Ireland, was conjoined with him, instead of Goodwin, who had just been promoted by Parliament (Jan. 8) to the Presidency of Magdalen College, Oxford. Owen and Sterry were to have £200 a year each, and lodgings in Whitehall.[1]

A good deal of the work of the Council and of the Parliament for some time consisted in enforcing the Engagement

---

[1] Council Order Books of dates given, and Commons Journals of Jan. 8, 1649—50.

(ante p. 124). The old Cavalier party do not seem to have made much difficulty, now that the Commonwealth was a year established; the Independents and Sects, and even the mass of the people generally, were very willing; even John Lilburne succumbed. He had been unusually quiet since his acquittal and release in the preceding November, notwithstanding a new grudge he owed to Government for their having declared void his election, December 21, to be a Common Councilman of the City of London; and he now approved of the Engagement—of course, only in a Lilburnian sense, and with explanation of that sense in a pamphlet. The chief opposition was among the Presbyterian clergy and the more conscientious of the Anglicans. Many of the former, including Mr. Baxter, preached against the Engagement; and there was even a violent public protest against it from the Lancashire and Cheshire ministers, on the ground that it was inconsistent with the Covenant and imposed by usurpers. Substantially, however, by good management, and considerable indulgence, the Engagement was made to answer its purpose.[1]

Amid much miscellaneous business through the next three or four months, descending to such matters as a Bill for the Better Packing of Butter, the Excise on Home-brewed Beer, and Rules against Contraband Tobacco and Logwood from America, one perceives a great, and indeed unnatural and overstrained, anxiety to prove to the Presbyterians that a Government of so-called Sectaries and Tolerationists could be as watchful, as earnest, for public Religion and Morality, as the Scottish Government of the Kirk or any other godly

---

[1] Neal's Puritans, IV. 9–11; Commons Journals, Dec. 26, 1649; and Lilburne's *Engagement Vindicated and Explained*, published Jan. 22, 1649—50. In this paper of eight pages, addressed to Alderman Tichbourne, Lilburne, who dates it "Dec. 1649," rehearses the circumstances of his election to the Common Council. He had qualified himself by taking a lodging in Alderman Tichbourne's ward; and on Friday last he had been summoned by the beadle, with the rest of the inhabitants, to the wardmote in the Blue Coat Hall, Christ Church. There he had been put in nomination by some friends, and elected by "a majority of hands"; whereupon the Alderman had tendered him the Engagement. He had consented to take it if he might explain his grounds; the Alderman had said that was not the business of the day; but, the crowd crying out *Hear him! Hear him!*, he had gone on speaking till the Alderman stopped him. He now therefore (his election having meanwhile been declared void) sends the Alderman his reasons on paper.

Government whatsoever. On February 22, an Act was passed for the Better Propagation of the Gospel in Wales; this was followed, March 1, by an Act for the Propagation of the Gospel in the four Northern Counties of England; there were subsequent Acts and Resolutions for the same object in other English districts and towns, all pointing to a comprehensive National Act; and on the 8th of March there was an express Act for the Advancement of the Gospel and of Learning in Ireland. This last promised new Irish Colleges, and ordained the immediate despatch to Dublin of six selected ministers, at £200 a year each. Always, too, on sufficient occasion, the Parliament, as hitherto, appointed a Solemn Day of Thanksgiving or of Fast and Humiliation, as the case might be, with the preachers that were to officiate before itself; and, though the Presbyterian clergy, for the most part, disavowed these days, and would preach and pray on both sides of them, rather than precisely *on* them, they had, at all events, the opportunity. We find also strong Sabbatarian Resolutions of the House, with condemnation of Anti-Sabbatarian books (March 1 and 8); we find a tremendous Act against Adultery and Kindred Offences (May 10); there was talk of a Bill against immodest dresses on women, face-painting, black patches, &c. (June 7); and, though that came to nothing, there was, by way of amends, a very strict Act of Penalties for the more masculine vice of Profane Swearing (June 28). More significant still, there was frequent recognition of the theological novelties broached in the preachings or books of the extreme Sectaries, ending (August 9) in an Act against "several Atheistical, blasphemous, and execrable opinions." For the promulgation of some such the punishment, in case of a second offence, was to be banishment, and death on return without leave. Clearly, in the attempt to give a good wide circle to Liberty of Opinion, but yet to draw a circumference somewhere, Parliament was sorely tried. Doubtless, the decrees about Morality and Religion expressed the real sentiments of many of the sterner Puritans of the Government; but one sees, I repeat, a factitious earnestness on those subjects, on the part of some at least, in order to vie with the Presbyterians in the esteem of the decent majority of the English people. What were Henry Marten's private reflections over the Act of May 10?[1]

While some of these measures of Home-Government were only coming to maturity, the Parliament and the Council of State were already deep in a war with the Scots.

The negotiations between Charles II. and the Argyle Government of Scotland, broken off at the Hague in June 1649, when the initiative in Ireland still seemed hopeful, had been resumed in November, when Cromwell's Irish victories had ruined that project, and left for Charles only the initiative in Scotland. Mr. George Winram of Liberton, one of the Senators of the Scottish College of Justice, had then been sent to Charles in Jersey to ascertain his state of mind. He had returned to Edinburgh on the 2nd of February, 1649–50, with the information that Charles was now reasonable, and would receive Commissioners for farther treaty at Breda. The Scottish Parliament, though not unanimously, did appoint such Commissioners—the Earls of Cassilis and Lothian, with two lairds, and two burgesses; with whom, on the part of the Kirk, were conjoined three ministers, of whom Baillie declined to be one. They sailed for Breda on the 9th of March, with instructions to treat for thirty days and no longer, and a warrant to borrow £300,000, to be given to the King if the result were satisfactory. After a hard struggle, the advice from the Queen Mother in France being strongly in favour of his yielding to all the Scottish conditions, but his own inclination and the advice of most of his English Counsellors being the other way, Charles did yield. On May $\frac{3}{13}$, 1650,[2] he signed a Treaty at Breda, pledging himself to uphold the Covenant and strict Presbytery all the days of his life, to sign the Covenant on his arrival in Scotland, to maintain the supremacy of Parliament in all civil matters and of the Kirk in all matters ecclesiastical, to forbid from his Court all persons excommunicated by the Kirk, and to declare his regret for certain sins of his father and grandfather, and for the idolatry of his mother. Through the time of the Treaty it had been a great sorrow to the Commissioners that his young Majesty had continued the use of the Service-Book and his Episcopal chaplains, and that there had been "balling and dancing" almost every night till day-break for the *élite* of Breda.[1]

---

[1] Commons Journals of dates given and of July 12 and 19, 1650. Henry Marten did oppose the Act of May 10, on the ground that the severity of the punishments would cause greater precaution against detection of the crimes, and so probably increase them (see Whitlocke, under May 14).

[2] The upper of the two figures for the day of the month in this fractional way of dating denotes the day in Old Style, i. e. as it was reckoned in England and Scotland; the under denotes the day in New Style, i. e. as it was reckoned abroad. There was a difference of ten days between the British and the foreign reckoning—the *earlier* date always representing the British. As the difference is sometimes historically important, but the fractional mode of dating is perplexing, I shall, in citing subsequent documents from abroad on the Breda business, date them by the Old Style, or the British reckoning.

What, amid all this, of poor Montrose, the one man who had sworn that, if ever Charles did enter Scotland, it should be with no shackles of Covenant or Presbytery? More than anything else, *his* passionate remonstrances had helped to break off the Treaty at the Hague; and no sooner had that rupture taken place than Charles, seeing no possible harm then from any enterprise of Montrose, however desperate, had reinvested him with the commission of Lieutenant-Governor and Captain-General of Scotland (June 1649). To this there had been added (July 6, 1649) a Commission making him Ambassador-Extraordinary for Charles to the northern Foreign Powers. The consequence had been that, through the autumn of 1649 and the winter of 1649–50, Montrose had been shooting through the north of Europe, from Holland into Germany, thence to Poland, and so to Denmark and Sweden, inflaming the souls of princes, and arranging for a descent on Scotland. Applause and encouragement had come to him in the course of this tour from Charles himself, from Queen Henrietta Maria, from the Duke of York, but chiefly from the ex-Queen of Bohemia. One may read with interest yet her sprightly and womanly letters to her "Jamie "Græme," as she called him, in which she told him how he alone, in the wretched coil of intrigue which was wound round the young King, by his mother, Lauderdale, and

---

[1] Balfour's Annals, IV. 2 et seq.; Napier's Montrose, 757; Life of Robert Blair (Wodrow Society) p. 226.

Hamilton, seemed the man to cut the knot. Charles's own last letters to Montrose, however, are the most vital. "I "conjure you, therefore, not to take alarm at any reports or "messages from others, but to depend upon my kindness and "to proceed in your business," Charles had written to him from Jersey, January 12, 1649–50, after the negotiation with the Argyle Government had been renewed, sending him at the same time the George and Riband of the Garter. "I "pray continue your assistance to the Marquis of Montrose," Charles had written to Montrose's relative and disciple, the young Lord Napier, at Hamburg, on the 15th of April, after the Treaty at Breda had begun. When that Treaty was concluded, there did, of course, go from Breda (May 5) a public letter to Montrose, informing him of the agreement made, and instructing him to persevere no longer in his design; but with that letter there went a private one from Charles, softening the tenor of the public one, and also four special instructions by the bearer (dated May 9), the first, second, and fourth of which were couched in these terms: 1. "If you "find that the prevailing party now in Scotland are not "satisfied with the concessions I have granted them, then "Montrose is not to lay down arms"; 2. "In case my friends "in Scotland do not think fit that Montrose lay down arms, "then as many as can may repair to him"; 4. "You shall "see if Montrose have a considerable number of men, and, if "he have, you must use your best endeavour to get them *not* "to be disbanded." When these letters were written and these instructions given, Charles knew that Montrose was in Scotland, but he did not know all that had happened there. The letter ordering Montrose to abandon his design, even if it had not been accompanied by the private contradictory instructions, would have been too late.[1] Before it was sent from Breda, Montrose had worked out his doom.

The Orkneys, then under the jurisdiction of the Royalist Earl of Morton, by a special grant to the family from

---

[1] Napier's Montrose, 705 et seq., where the letters to Montrose from Charles, the Duke of York, Henrietta Maria and the ex-Queen of Bohemia, are given from the originals in the Montrose Charter-room.

Charles I., had been selected by Montrose as the best point for a landing in Scotland. Thither indeed, as early as September 1649, by means furnished him chiefly by the King of Denmark, he had embarked a small force of Germans and Danes, to be under the command of Morton's nephew, the Earl of Kinnoull, till he himself should arrive. Hardly had they landed when both Morton and Kinnoull died, within a few days of each other (November 1649), so that the little force remained useless among the Orkney-men. Of a second force, of about 1200 men, with twelve brass guns, which Montrose had meanwhile levied by the help of the King of Denmark, the Queen of Sweden, and the Duke of Holstein, and which he had despatched from Gottenburg in Sweden, under the conduct of the new Earl of Kinnoull, brother and successor of the last, more than five-sixths had been lost by shipwreck and desertion, so that only about 200 reached the Orkneys (February 1649–50). At length, crossing from Gottenburg with what more he had collected, Montrose had arrived himself, late in March. O then the bustle throughout the Orkneys! That, however, was but the rendezvous; and in April, while the Treaty of Breda was going on, Montrose and his whole motley army of some 1500 Germans, Danes, and Orkneymen, officered by refugee Scots, with the notorious renegado Sir John Urry as their Major-General, had passed to the mainland, and begun their southward course from John o' Groats. Among their standards was a great black one for the King, with a bloody head upon it, while Montrose's own standard was of white damask, blazoned with his famous device of the lion rampant to spring the chasm between two rocks, and the explanatory motto, *Nil medium.* Alas! standards and blazons were to be nearly all. Through the shires of Caithness and Sutherland he had advanced, amid or towards the Highland material of Grants, Guns, Mackenzies, and what not, the explosion of which by his presence, as in his great Highland marches of 1644–5, was the climax of his calculations. Somehow this time the material would not explode. The Seaforth Mackenzies did not rise in front of him; the nearer natives gazed at the great black flag with the bloody head, and then only fled in horror; the Earl of Sutherland was on the alert to protect his region; David Leslie's army, which had marched north-west from Brechin, was not now far off. A detachment from it, at least, was much nearer than Montrose imagined. On Saturday, April 27, he was lying at Corbiesdale, in Strathoikel, North Ross-shire, when Lieutenant-Colonel Archibald Strachan, with a body of Leslie's horse, fell upon him by an adroit ambuscade, and there was a repetition of Philiphaugh. Much worse! Among the killed were eleven officers, including the standard-bearer, Menzies of Pitfoddels; nearly all the rest were made prisoners, including Viscount Frendraught, Major-General Urry, and about thirty other officers; Montrose himself, who had been wounded, and his friend the Earl of Kinnoull, were among the few that escaped. For a day or two the fugitives wandered up the banks of the Oikel, Montrose first abandoning his horse, then throwing away his cloak, sword, seal, and Star of the Garter, and at last changing dresses with a Highland peasant. They were half-starved when they reached the country of Assynt, and there Kinnoull, who could move no further, was left to die among the hills, while Montrose went on to his fate. Taken, May 4, by Macleod of Assynt, once his friend, he was delivered up to Leslie at Tain, and thence conveyed towards Edinburgh in most miserable plight, tied by ropes to a small Highland pony, and still wearing the ragged dark-reddish plaid he had borrowed from the peasant. At one stage of the journey, passing Kinnaird House, the seat of his father-in-law, the Earl of Southesk, he saw two of his children. Having been provided by friendly hands at Dundee with all necessaries, he was in a garb more befitting his rank when he entered Edinburgh. This was on Saturday, May 18. That day all the city was astir to see James Graham, the excommunicated and already condemned traitor, whose sentence had been decreed in Parliament the day before, brought first from Leith to Holyrood and the Canongate, mounted on a cart-horse, and then from the Canongate, up the High Street, to the Tolbooth, tied bareheaded to a chair on a cart drawn by four horses, the hangman riding on the foremost, while a row of the minor prisoners from Corbiesdale, big Sir John Urry conspicuous among them, marched two and two in front. Of the next three days what minute accounts by contemporaries in historic prose, and what later representations by Scottish poets and painters, worshippers of Montrose! One sees him most distinctly on Monday the 20th, when he appeared before the Parliament to receive his sentence, "in a suit of black cloth, and a "scarlet coat to his knee, lined with crimson taffeta, on his "head a beaver hat and silver band," unmoved and undaunted, save that several times he "rolled his eyes alongst "all the corners of the house," and that he looked, as the same spectator thought, "somewhat pale, lank-faced, and "hairy." The next day, Tuesday the 21st of May, 1650, the sentence was executed. Having walked, in a splendid dress of scarlet and silver lace, from the Tolbooth, a little down the High Street, to the Cross, Montrose was hanged, at three o'clock in the afternoon, on a very high gibbet erected there, with his Biography by Wishart tied round his neck. After he had hung for three hours, his head was cut off, to be exposed on a spike at the Tolbooth, and his legs and arms, to be sent to Glasgow, Aberdeen, Perth, and Stirling; and then, as he had given no satisfaction to the ministers who had been incessant in their attendance on him in his last days, his limbless trunk was buried by the hangman's men at the foot of another gibbet in the heath called Boroughmuir.[1]

No satisfaction of any kind, indeed, had the dead man given. He had pleaded the late King's commission and authority for his acts in his former enterprise and the commission and authority of Charles II. for his acts in the new one; but, though the news of the Treaty of Breda can have reached him only after his capture, and first fully in Edinburgh, any reflections he may have had on the young Stuart's conduct to himself in that matter remained unuttered. He had been warned, indeed, by Argyle and the rest to be careful of speaking to the young King's disadvantage; and, whether on account of the warning or without needing it, he had, in his various speeches, said not a word to prejudice Charles's chances from the Breda Treaty. "It is spoken of me," had been part of his address on the scaffold, "that I would blame "the King. God forbid! For the late King, he lived a "saint, and died a martyr: I pray God I may end as he did; "if ever I could wish my soul in another man's stead, it "should be in his. For his Majesty now living, never any "people, I believe, might be more happy in a King. His "commands to me were most just, and I obeyed them." Besides this final proclamation of the boundless Royalism which he had made his creed, the sole political testament he had left lay perhaps in a few words in his interview with the deputation of clerical inquisitors who had waited on him, in the Tolbooth, on the part of the Commission of the Kirk, the day before his death. Charged by them with breach of the Covenant, he had distinguished, as on former occasions, between the National Scottish Covenant, which he had subscribed and served, and the Solemn League and Covenant, which he had never subscribed. "The Covenant which I took," he said, "I "own it and adhere to it: Bishops, I care not for them; I "never intended to advance *their* interest." And so, at the age of thirty-seven, a sort of Presbyterian after all, this most blazing Royalist of his time had gone out of the world. Imaging the mode of his death, he had penned in the Tolbooth of Edinburgh this metrical prayer:—

---

[1] Balfour's Annals, IV. 8—22; Napier's Montrose, 723—809. Sir John Urry was beheaded at the Cross of Edinburgh, May 29, with a Captain Spotswood, one of his fellow captives of Corbiesdale; and others of Montrose's following suffered.

"Let them bestow on every airt a limb;
Then open all my veins, that I may swim
To Thee, my Maker, in that crimson lake;
Then place my parboiled head upon a stake,
Scatter my ashes, strew them in the air!
Lord, since Thou know'st where all these atoms are,
I'm hopeful Thou'lt recover once my dust,
And confident Thou'lt raise me with the just." [1]

---

[1] Balfour, IV. 19—22; Napier, 787 and 796.—It is worth remarking that, though the real backbone of Scottish history, the massive and prevalent tradition of the national life, since the sixteenth century, has undoubtedly been Knox and Presbyterianism, yet this would hardly be learnt from Scottish Poetry and Art. They have found their national themes and heroes rather in

On Saturday, May 25, four days after the execution of Montrose, there were read in the Scottish Parliament letters from Charles II. at Breda, dated May 12, "showing that he "was heartily sorry that James Graham had invaded this "kingdom, and how he had discharged him from doing the "same, and earnestly desiring the Estates of Parliament to "do himself that justice as not to believe that he was accessory to the said invasion in the least degree." Argyle confirmed this from private letters, with the addition that "his "Majesty was noways sorry that James Graham was defait, "in respect he had made that invasion without and contrary "to his command." There was produced also a duplicate of his Majesty's Breda missive to Montrose ordering him to disband. It was, of course, the public one, of date May 5, never received by Montrose, and in fact not dispatched from Breda till Montrose was already a prisoner and his invasion in ruins. The very day he had been brought to Edinburgh, the bearer of that dispatch, Sir William Fleming, with a pass from Charles II., "for our particular affairs," dated from Breda, May 10, was already in Edinburgh, with the dispatch in his pocket, and also the less presentable accompaniments. Did Argyle know all, or could he only guess? In either case, and in any case, what a pack of Presbyterian half-hypocrites the Argyle Government had become! In the name of Knox, and in the name of Henderson, they were engaged in jugglery which the soul of either would have abhorred; nor, among the thousand parish-ministers surrounding them, was there any genuine successor of Knox or Henderson to tell them that fact scourgingly, or to sway them towards a truthful

the picturesque side-spurts, eddies, or temporary back-tides of the real stream —e. g. Montrose's exploits, Claverhouse's, the Jacobite Rebellions, and Prince Charlie. Sir Walter Scott helped greatly to this substitution of the exceptional for the normal in the artistic representation of Scottish history; but the literary habit is older than his time, and an investigation of its causes might be curious. Is it that, Calvinism and Presbyterianism never having befriended Art, the *victæ causæ* of Scottish history have hitherto actually bred more singers and painters than the *causa victrix*? or is it that the facts and feelings of the *victæ causæ* have, by their very nature, hitherto suited most singers and painters best, whatever their parentage and ancestry? One sees the same phenomenon in the tendency to vote the *kilt* to be the fit garb of Scotchmen universally when they would idealize their nationality. Do not Scotchmen in all whose ancestry there was not a kilt, and who have no right to the garb but what taste may give, now wear it on state occasions?

path. Scotland had made her Treaty of Breda, and was expecting her sovereign.[1]

He arrived, with three ships, at Speymouth on the Morayshire coast on Sunday, June 23, a month after the death of Montrose. There came with him the young Duke of Buckingham, the Earl of Cleveland, Viscount Grandison, Lord Wentworth, Lord Wilmot, and others of his English courtiers, and the Duke of Hamilton and the Earl of Lauderdale, the two banished chiefs of the Scottish Engagement of 1648, besides the Earls of Cassilis and Lothian, Mr. John Livingstone, parish-minister of Ancram in Roxburghshire, and the other Scottish Commissioners, lay and clerical, who had made the Breda Treaty. The variety of company on shipboard was full of meaning. Charles had, in fact, tried to baulk the Scottish Government by making his voyage before it had been arranged whom he should bring with him. Fresh instructions on this very point had been sent to the Commissioners at Breda, with intimation that the Treaty would even then be given up if Charles did not comply; but Charles had evaded the question by being already on shipboard with the English and Scottish courtiers most objected to, and the Commissioners, after much consultation, had thought it best to go with him, either to settle the question during the voyage, or to leave it to be settled in Scotland. Mr. Livingstone, indeed, who took a stronger view of the case, and had resolved to remain in Holland, rather than return with the King in such bad company, had been brought on board and detained there only by stratagem. Nevertheless it was this Mr. Livingstone, on shipboard with Charles against his own will, that mainly helped to amend matters, as far as they could be amended, before Charles set foot in Scotland. There was much discussion during the voyage, with the exchange of written papers; but all seemed wrong, and the Commissioners were in the worst of humours. What was their surprise, therefore, when on Friday the 21st, before they were in sight of Scotland, they were told by Charles that he was ready to subscribe and swear to the Covenant. This was actually more than the Argyle Government had demanded, for they had required only that he would acknowledge and uphold the Covenant, and take it personally in Scotland if the Kirk should see fit. Perhaps he hoped, by this excess of concession, to obtain indulgence in the matter of his choice of courtiers. At all events Mr. Livingstone took care that, if he would sign the Covenant, he should do it thoroughly. Precisely on that Sabbath-day, June 23, when the ships were off Speymouth, and Charles had his first view of Scottish scenery, Livingstone preached before him and read to him, slowly and deliberately, both the Covenants. Even on that morning it had been signified that the King might like to qualify his oath by a word or two respecting its application to England; but Livingstone had stopped the proposal. At the very last, "seeing "both the King and they were in some heat and distemper "by their debating and disputing," Livingstone suggested the postponement of the ceremony to the next day. But then it was Charles's turn to be peremptory. He would sign and swear at once, and have it over. And so, on the Morayshire coast, it was done, the ship riding at anchor.[1]

---

[1] Balfour, IV. 24—25; Napier, 764—766; Whitlocke, of date May 18, 1650. Mr. Napier, who has quoted all the documents in his narrative, brings out very forcibly the significance of their dates, though with some conclusions of his own.

The Covenanted King stepped ashore on Monday the 24th of June and began his progress southwards. On the 27th he was at Aberdeen, where he saw one of Montrose's limbs on the Justice Port; Sunday the 29th he spent at Kinnaird House, where Montrose had taken leave of his children; on July 1 he was in Dundee; and, after some days at St. Andrew's, he took up his residence at Falkland Palace, July 6. By this time the question of his Household and the Composition of his Court had been settled. Parliament had made out a pretty numerous list of persons, with Hamilton and Lauderdale at their head, who were to be removed from about him; but he was permitted to retain Buckingham, Wentworth, Wilmot, and some other Englishmen, as gentlemen of the Bedchamber, with his physician, Dr. Fraser, and other named attendants. And thus the witty Buckingham and Charles together had those first experiences of theirs in pure Presbyterian ways which were to be matter of jocular reminiscence and uproarious mimicry between them in future years. From Charles's landing to his arrival at Falkland there had been ministers incessantly about him, inspecting him, correcting him, instructing him, "using much freedom with him"; and the names of the Reverend men, with the texts they preached from, may be recovered yet by the curious. At Falkland there was a special reinforcement of the clerical part of his Court in the persons of three ministers of peculiar celebrity, sent by the Commission of the Kirk (July 6); and, the General Assembly having met in Edinburgh, with Mr. Andrew Cant for Moderator, a few days afterwards (July 10), "a very kind and loving letter" went from the King to that body, which they reciprocated with joy over his happy return, and with a deputation of three more ministers to Falkland "to congratulate his home-coming and to motion his renewing of the Covenant." The signing on shipboard was good so far; but would he not gratify his subjects by repeating the Act where he now was, in the heart of Scotland, and in one of his own royal palaces?[1]

---

[1] Balfour's Annals, IV. 41 et seq.; Life of Robert Blair (Wodrow Society), 227—230.

In England, watching all this in Scotland, one thing had been settled long ago. Cromwell must be recalled from Ireland, to take the management of the now greater business with the Scots. As early as January 8, requests from Parliament had been sent to him to come over when he could; and on the 13th of April, when the Treaty of Breda was in progress, the desire had been repeated more urgently.[2]

By that time Cromwell had brought affairs in Ireland into such order that he might entrust the farther care of them to others. Having opened his new campaign in January 1649–50, he had added fresh successes to those of the previous year. Chief among these had been his reduction of Kilkenny, the central seat of the Roman Catholic confederacy (March 28). One other service, however, Cromwell thought necessary before he left. This was the reduction of Clonmel, defended by Hugh O'Neile, a son of the late Owen Roe O'Neile. Great exertions were made by Ormond for the relief of the place, and O'Neile's own defence was more obstinate and brave than anything Cromwell had yet encountered in Ireland. It was not, therefore, till the 9th of May that the place was taken, and then only after a storm, and with honourable terms to the inhabitants. The siege of Waterford would have been Cromwell's next business; but that, and the government of Ireland generally, he resolved to leave in the hands of his son-in-law Ireton. In the preceding December Ireton had been appointed by Parliament to the Presidency of Munster; and now Cromwell, still retaining the titular Lord-Lieutenancy of Ireland, commissioned him as his Deputy in that supreme office. There was still a remnant of the Rebellion; but, for the most part, the country had been effectively reduced, and already there had begun, with Cromwell's encouragement, that vast emigration of Roman Catholic officers and soldiers which was to recruit the armies of France and Spain, and transmit Irish blood, with Irish fighting ability, and Irish names, some of them most honourably, in the history of those Catholic lands.[1]

---

[1] Balfour, IV. 65 et seq. and 82 et seq.; Life of Blair, 230—232.

[2] Commons Journals of dates given.

Cromwell was back in London on the 31st of May, amid acclamations of welcome all along a procession of prearranged ceremony, which formed itself at Hounslow and ended at Whitehall. Three months before (Feb. 25) Parliament had voted him the best part of this Palace, known as the Cockpit, for his mansion so long as he liked, with St. James's House and Spring Garden in addition, and the command of St. James's Park. On the 4th of June he was in his place in the House, receiving thanks for his great services in a most eloquent oration by the Speaker; and on the 11th he gave a large narrative to the House of events in Ireland, with his views of the requirements of that country. Thenceforward, however, through the rest of June, there was little said of

---

[1] Carlyle's Cromwell, II. 99—151; Godwin, III. 158—162; Commons Journals of Dec. 4, 1649 and July 2, 1650. On this latter date Parliament confirmed Cromwell's appointment of Ireton to be his Deputy Lord-Lieutenant.

Ireland, and the thoughts of Parliament and of the Council of State were turned to Scotland. Here, however, there was a temporary difficulty. The wish of the Government, and of none more earnestly than Cromwell, was that Fairfax, still the General-in-Chief of all the forces of the Commonwealth, should undertake the war with the Scots in that continued capacity, lending it the countenance of his great and virtuous name, while Cromwell should, as heretofore, do the real work as Fairfax's second in command. This was actually arranged by Parliament, June 12, and Fairfax accepted the arrangement. Soon, however, his own meditations and the influence of his Presbyterian wife raised scruples in his mind. A defensive war against a Scottish invasion of England he was most willing to head; but was it not something very different that was now proposed? Most certainly it was! Weighing all the intelligence that had come from Scotland, Cromwell and the other chiefs had concluded that it would be folly to wait for a Scottish invasion of England, and that the right method would be to assume war as already declared by the Scots, and march north at once to plant the scene of it "in their own bowels." Fairfax could not reconcile this to his conscience, or to his interpretation of the Solemn League and Covenant. He resigned his commission; and on the 26th of June Cromwell became, for the first time, Captain-General and Commander-in-Chief of all the forces of England. On the same day Parliament voted a Declaration of the Reasons for the Expedition into Scotland; and three days afterwards (June 29), when Charles II. had been nearly a week in Scotland, Cromwell began his northward march. His army consisted of 7500 foot and 3500 horse, commanded under him by Lieutenant-General Charles Fleetwood, Major-General Lambert, Commissary-General Whalley, and Monk, Pride, and Robert Overton, among the Colonels. Before he went it had been arranged that Harrison should be Commander-in-Chief in England during his absence, and that Skippon should command in London. With special trouble on Cromwell's part, it had also been arranged that Ludlow should go to Ireland as Lieutenant-General under Ireton, and to be one of Ireton's fellow-Commissioners in the Irish Civil Government.[1]

During Cromwell's month in London, one very serious piece of news had been received from abroad. Mr. Anthony Ascham, whom we saw accredited, by Milton's Latin letters of February 4, 1649–50, as Envoy from the Commonwealth to Spain, had shared the fate of Dorislaus. He had just arrived in Madrid, where, notwithstanding the vehement remonstrances of Hyde and Cottington, the Spanish King had consented to receive him, and he was dining at an inn, which he had made his quarters till a house could be provided, when (June 6 in foreign reckoning, May 27 in English) six English refugees entered the room and stabbed him dead, and also his Spanish interpreter. The assassins, one of whom, to the consternation of Hyde and Cottington, was their own servant, Harry Progers, then went for refuge to the Venetian ambassador's, but, being denied admittance, took sanctuary in the nearest church. The Spanish Government concerned themselves so far as even to threaten Hyde and Cottington in pretty round terms, at the same time securing Ascham's goods and papers, and giving his Secretary a guard till he could return to England. The news came to London on the 19th of June, and the indignation was great. One effect of it, and of contemporary news of secret movements among the English Royalists in prospect of the Scottish war, was that Parliament resolved to retaliate by bringing to trial for their lives several eminent delinquents that had been for some time in detention in various prisons. Six were selected (June 28—July 4), of whom one was Sir William Davenant the poet. He had been recently taken at sea on his way to Virginia, whither he was conducting a number of French artificers, chiefly weavers, much wanted in that colony. Steps were taken for trying him and the other five before the High Court of Justice, and meanwhile they lay in jail.[2]

---

[1] Carlyle's Cromwell, II. 148, and 156—7; Commons Journals of days given, and of July 2; Whitlocke, June 25; Ludlow's Memoirs (1698) 314—323.

[2] Thurloe, I. 148—151; Clarendon, 747—8; Whitlocke, June 20; Commons Journals, June 28 and July 3 and 4; Council Order Book, July 2; Wood's

Before following Cromwell into Scotland, we must rest a moment on the retirement of Fairfax. His resignation of the Commandership-in-Chief, rather than head the invasion of Scotland and an offensive war against Charles II. in that country, was equivalent, in fact, to a secession from all active share thenceforward in the Government of the Commonwealth. He had adhered to the Commonwealth, on principles of honour and expediency, after the execution of Charles I., though with the express understanding that he had not approved of that act; he had, by Cromwell's persuasions, accepted his nomination to be one of the members of the First Council of State; he had attended occasionally in that Council of State and in the next, living a good deal in London, and taking part in political affairs, though less assiduous in those than in the duties of his Commandership-in-Chief, or, as we should now say, his duties at the Horse-Guards. Apparently, however, his heart had never been quite at ease so near the centre of the new English Republic which his generalship had helped to create. Lady Fairfax, it seems, had been less at ease; and her influence, in the crisis of June 1650, had at last decided him. It was Cromwell thenceforth that was to be even nominally the military head of the Commonwealth, as he had been actually for a long time its highest military hero; and Fairfax, though twelve years younger than Cromwell, was to lead thenceforth the life of a retired English nobleman. What could be more pleasant? He had his great estates and fine houses in his native Yorkshire, especially his newly-built brick mansion of Nunappleton, with its central hall, fifty yards long, its two wings, its many rooms with marble mantelpieces, its flower-gardens, its stables, its noble park of oaks stretching away to the north and full of deer, and a rich country all round, dotted with the seats of his neighbours and dependents. And, though he was but thirty-nine years of age, and war had been hitherto the occupation of his life, and in the field it had been

Ath. III. 805. A vote was taken, July 3, whether Davenant should be one of the six to be tried. The *Yeas* and the *Noes* were equal, twenty-seven on both sides; and the Speaker gave his casting vote in Davenant's favour. Next day, however, it was resolved, after all, to try him.

observed that he was no mere mechanical soldier that could marshal his men coolly, but one on whom the battle-phrenzy would come as powerfully at some moments as on Cromwell himself, yet there was much in his nature that made seclusion now and a change of habits far from unwelcome. He was a man of scholarly and literary tastes, fond of books and engravings, a *virtuoso* in coins and medals, and not without a certain thoughtful and philosophic vein, which he could melt into thickish verse when he pleased. Adieu, then, to London and public affairs, and hey for Nunappleton House, with one's library round one, a daily walk round the stables or through the glades of the park, or a ride over the country to visit neighbours, always returning for readings in the evening, and, if there were no other company, the society of Lady Fairfax and Little Moll! For by this name Lord and Lady Fairfax called their only child, Mary, now just twelve years of age. Her education was to be one of Fairfax's chief cares and pleasures at Nunappleton; and, to assist him, more especially in teaching her languages, he had secured the services of a very fit tutor, of whom we shall hear in time. It seems to have been shortly after Fairfax's resignation of his command at the end of June 1650 that the family removed to Nunappleton, the tutor accompanying or following; and thence, for years to come, the news of the great ex-general that was to reach the world was to be mainly to the effect that he was completely happy in his solitude, translating classic authors and French and Italian books, compiling a History of the Church, and writing a metrical version of the Psalms, with occasional poems besides. In time this little piece, on the fatal 30th of January, the anniversary of the execution of King Charles, was to come from his pen:—

"Oh let that day from Time be blotted quite,
And let belief of 't in next age be waived,
In deepest silence the act concealed aright,
So that the Kingdom's credit might be saved;
But, if the Power Divine permit not this,
His will's the law, and ours must acquiesce."

At the moment at which we now leave him he had perhaps not reached such a distinct mood of returning Stuartism, and the following may more exactly represent him in his first retirement at Nunappleton:—

"O how I love these solitudes,
And places silent as the night,
There where no thronging multitudes
Disturb with noise their sweet delight!
O how mine eyes are pleased to see
Oaks that such spreading branches bear,
Which, from old Time's nativity
And the envy of so many a year,
Are still green, beautiful, and fair,
As at the world's first day they were!"[1]

Scotland was in great excitement at the approach of "the Blasphemer Cromwell" and his Army of Sectaries. The Scottish Parliament had adjourned, July 5, after having made arrangements. They had put all power into the hands of a large Committee of Estates, with Argyle at their head, of whom fifteen were to be a quorum. They had decreed new levies, so as to bring the total of the Scottish army up to about 23,000 men; and, the Earl of Leven having asked leave to resign his commandership-in-chief on account of his age and infirmities, they had, while handsomely retaining him in the honorary post, deputed the real command to his namesake, Lieutenant-General David Leslie. It was Leslie's policy to clear the South of Scotland as much as possible in front of Cromwell's advance, so as to deprive him of supplies; and the rumours which were spread among the inhabitants of those parts of the murderous habits of the Sectaries contributed to that result. The rendezvous of the Scottish levies was at Leith. Thither they poured in through the first weeks of July; and on the 29th of that month his young Majesty, who had meanwhile moved from Falkland to Perth, thence to Dunfermline, and thence to Stirling, was brought to Leith, to behold his subjects in array, and to show himself in the midst of their cheering ranks. He remained with them only till the 2nd of August, when, much against his will, he was sent back to Dunfermline to be out of the way.[1]

---

[1] Markham's Life of Fairfax, 352—370, with specimens of Fairfax's Poetry (mostly still in MS.) in Appendix.

The war had then already begun, for on the 22nd of July Cromwell had crossed the Tweed, and begun his march to Edinburgh. Declarations and Proclamations preceded him, reasoning with the Scots on their absurd calumnies against himself and his Army, explaining the real design of his invasion, and the bounds within which he would confine it, and imploring all the true Partakers of the Faith among the Scottish People, of whom he did not doubt there were many, to reconsider their bargain with Charles II. Counter Declarations came from the Scottish Estates and Kirk, and the documents were crossing each other in the air. One of the most interesting is Cromwell's Letter of August 3, "to the "General Assembly of the Kirk of Scotland, or, in case of "their not sitting, to the Commissioners of the Kirk of "Scotland." It was in reply to the Answer which the General Assembly had put forth, July 22, to the main Declaration of the English Army. The Assembly had since then adjourned, so that Cromwell's reply came, as he supposed it might, to the Assembly's Deputies, the Kirk Commissioners. It was meant, however, for all the Scottish clergy, and this was the style:—"Is it therefore infallibly "agreeable to the Word of God, all that *you* say? I beseech "you, in the bowels of Christ, think it possible you may be "mistaken. Precept may be upon precept, line may be upon "line, and yet the Word of the Lord may be to some a Word "of Judgment, that they may fall backward, and be broken "and be snared and taken! There may be a spiritual fulness, "which the World may call drunkenness; as in the second "chapter of the *Acts*. There may be, as well, a carnal con- "fidence upon misunderstood and misapplied precepts, which "may be called spiritual drunkenness. There may be a "*Covenant* made with Death and Hell! I will not say yours

---

[1] Balfour's Annals, IV. 58—86; Life of Robert Blair, 232—235.

"was so." He advised them, in conclusion, to read the twenty-eighth chapter of Isaiah, from the fifth to the fifteenth verse. He was then at Musselburgh, close to Leslie's army, and within a few miles of Edinburgh.[1]

Leslie's able and cautious strategy delayed the catastrophe for a whole month. Round about Edinburgh, all that month, on the Pentland Hills, on the Braid Hills, on Arthur Seat, on the Corstorphine Hills, and elsewhere, there were movements and countermovements of the two armies, with skirmishes and retreats, but nothing decisive. In the art of military manœuvring, at least, Cromwell had found his match. One advantage he had over Leslie. His army obeyed him implicitly, whereas round Leslie, in the Scottish army, there was the Committee of the Estates, with Commissioners of the Kirk, intruding their advice, and impeding military tactics by political and theological discussions. It is odd that these, which ought surely to have been gone through before, should have become most intricate and perplexing after Leslie was in the field. But, in fact, Cromwell's presence, and perhaps the homethrusts in his Letters and Declarations, had stirred into activity doubts and questionings that had been lurking for the past month among the Scots as to the righteousness of their armed enterprise for Charles Stuart after all. As far back as June 25, when Charles had just arrived, and before Cromwell had left London, Lord Warriston, with five Lairds and Burgesses, had braved, in open Parliament, the imputation of sympathy with the English Sectaries, or at least insufficient hatred of them, by dissenting from the general vote of new levies for the King's cause. This must have been symptomatic of a good deal of diffused reluctance, both among the people and among the clergy. Now, however, that Cromwell had invaded Scotland, and was actually at the gates of Edinburgh, even that native reluctance, it is evident, could not assert itself in the direct and unpatriotic form of a declaration that Cromwell ought not to be opposed. It transmuted itself, therefore, into a wild effort to rectify, at the very last, the basis on which he should be opposed. In other words, what was really tending to be a dubious kind of pro-Cromwellianism in the Scottish mind, but was prevented from taking that name by natural indignation against an invader, and by ingrained habits of ultra-Presbyterian prejudices, broke out for the nonce as a kind of super-ultra-Presbyterianism. In this form the feeling was powerful enough to affect the counsels both of the Argyle Committee of Estates and of the whole Committee of the Kirk even after the two armies were manœuvring round and round Edinburgh. Thus, from the 2nd of August to the 5th there were orders from the Committee of Estates for what was called "purging" Leslie's army, i. e. removing from it all officers whose imperfect Presbyterianism might bring down God's judgments on the Scottish side of the fighting. But that was not all. The King himself, as the central object on the Scottish side, needed farther purifying, both in his principles and in his household, before God's favour could be expected, and consequently before the Kirk could "own his interest." On the 9th of August, accordingly, he was waited upon by a conjoint deputation from the Committee of Estates and the Kirk, "to intreat him that he would be graciously pleased "to subscribe" a certain Declaration which Argyle had delivered to him some days before. It was a very portentous Declaration, for it exacted from Charles not only fresh vows of his zeal for the Covenant and pure Presbytery, but also a positive expression at last of his "deep humiliation and "affliction of spirit before God," on account of his father's opposition to the work of God in his two Kingdoms, and on account of the intolerable idolatry of his mother. This mechanical compulsion of Charles to his knees, it seems to have been thought, would acquit all Scotland; and Heaven, beholding the young King kneeling, though he was held by the neck to make him do it, might accept the oblation, as the utmost that circumstances permitted, and incline against Cromwell. In vain Charles refused, and entreated, and pleaded the unseemliness of requiring him to asperse his father's memory and the religion of his mother. They did hold him by the neck, and, after repeated interviews with deputations at Dunfermline, he did there sign the Declaration, slightly modified, on the 16th of August.[1]

---

[1] Carlyle's Cromwell, II. 161—170. Balfour notes Cromwell's letter to the Commission of the Kirk as "most "ridiculous and blasphemous," and a contemporary letter of his to the Committee of Estates as "in effect nothing "but a rhapsody of boasting and hyper-"bolic nonsense" (Annals, IV. 89.)

Heaven did at length seem to incline against Cromwell. On the 30th of August it was reluctantly determined in his Council of Officers that there must be a retreat to Dunbar. They might occupy and fortify that coast town, and at all events they would there be near supplies from Newcastle by English ships. They did retreat from Musselburgh next day, Leslie following at once with his whole army, and the rumour spreading that Cromwell was in flight back to England with Leslie in chase. To block the roads and passes beyond Dunbar was Leslie's effort; and, having done this very dexterously, he encamped his army on the hills behind Dunbar, watching Cromwell on the plain beneath, caught, as in a trap, with no outlet southwards, and with his back to the town and the sea. So the two armies lay all through Monday the 2nd of September, Cromwell really anxious. "We are upon an engagement very difficult," he wrote that day in an urgent sea-dispatch to Sir Arthur Hasilrig at Newcastle, describing his situation, and giving Sir Arthur certain directions to be followed "whatever becomes of us," but adding, "Our spirits are comfortable, praised be the Lord, though our present condition be as it is." Late in the afternoon, not long after this letter was written, Cromwell, walking with Lambert on a part of the ground he occupied, perceived that famous and unaccountable descent of his enemy from the hills, "shogging" always towards their right, which came upon him like a flash of light, and revealed his opportunity. It was said afterwards that Leslie and his officers had been induced to the imprudent movement, against their own judgment, by the importunities of the Committee-men, who were impatient for Cromwell's ruin. In any case it was Cromwell's deliverance. Confirmed in his own opinion by Lambert and Monk, he gave his orders that night; and early in the morning of next day, Tuesday, September 3, 1650, there was the great Battle of Dunbar, in which Cromwell, with his 11,000 English, beat disastrously Leslie's 20,000 Scots or more, slaying 3000, and taking 10,000 prisoners, with a loss to the victors of not more than twenty men.[1]

---

[1] Balfour's Annals, IV. 89—96.

The immediate effect of the Battle of Dunbar was to put Cromwell in possession of Edinburgh and Leith, and virtually of all the Eastern portion of the Scottish Lowlands south of the Firth of Forth. Edinburgh Castle still held out under its Governor, Walter Dundas; but, while attending to that and to other matters, Cromwell, inhabiting again his old Edinburgh quarters in Moray House in the Canongate, had little else to do for the next few months than survey the extraordinary agitation of native Scottish elements which his victory had produced in the districts that lay yet beyond his control. There is evidence, indeed, that he had resolved from the first on a very different method with Scotland from that which he had applied to Ireland, and that, after Dunbar, he was willing to give the Scots, as perverse and mistaken brethren rather than real enemies, every chance of rectifying their own course. One of his first acts after entering Edinburgh was to offer certain Scottish clergymen who had taken refuge in the Castle liberty to return unmolested to their charges. They declined the offer rather peevishly, as Cromwell thought; and he had a correspondence with them on the subject, in which they certainly had not the advantage.[2]

To Cromwell, surveying from Edinburgh all of Scotland that yet lay beyond his grasp, the spectacle was that of a division of the natives into three Parties, intermixed over the whole area, but each possessing more particularly one section of the map, and each with its leading military man:—(1) There was The Argyle or Government Party, shattered at Dunbar, but trying to recover itself. At the head of the party was still the Marquis of Argyle, whose personal supremacy seems, indeed, to have been at no time more marked than just after the Battle of Dunbar. This was the time, at all events, when he had Charles II. most absolutely in his power, and could regard his own political future and the fortunes of his family as most intimately bound up with the cause of that prince. This was the time when, according to a very credible tradition, there was a project that Charles should confirm his Presbyterianism, and strengthen his hold upon the Scots, by marrying one of Argyle's daughters. Certain it is that in a private letter-manual of Charles, dated at Perth, Sept. 24th, 1650, he put on record his desire "to let the world see how sensible" he was of the great services done him by the Marquis, and promised therefore to "make him Duke of Argyle and Knight of the Garter" whenever he should himself think it convenient to claim those honours, and also "to hearken to his counsels" in future, and, as soon as Royalty should be re-established in England, to "see him paid the £40,000 sterling" due to him: "all which I do promise to make good upon the word of a King: CHARLES R." Lord Lorne, the eldest son of the Marquis, who had recently returned from his travels, and had fought at Dunbar as a colonel of footguards, was in close attendance on the King when this letter was written, with a reputation for a more passionate kind of loyalty, or at least greater studiousness of his young Majesty's feelings and wishes, than suited his father's colder nature. Evidently there was a certain compact between Charles and the Argyle family, on the faith of which the astute Marquis had undertaken the management of the more open relations between his Majesty and the surviving government. What was this surviving government? It was represented by the *Committee of Estates*, i. e. that pretty numerous body of Parliamentary Nobles, Lairds, and Burgesses, of which fifteen were a quorum, and the assiduous chiefs of which, after Argyle, were Chancellor Loudoun, Warriston, and the Earls of Lothian, Cassilis, and Eglintoun; but it virtually included also the *Commission of the Kirk*, i. e. that much more numerous body of ministers and lay elders to which the last General Assembly had deputed interim powers, and of which nineteen (if the majority were ministers) were the authorized quorum. Driven from Edinburgh, the members of both these bodies, in sufficient numbers to constitute a quorum in each, had transferred themselves to Stirling and the district round. Accordingly, the King being then at Perth, the central district of Scotland, between and around Perth and Stirling, was what may be called the Government Region. Thither also had retired the relics of the beaten Scottish Army, with the old Earl of Leven as their nominal commander-in-chief, but Lieutenant-General David Leslie as their real commander. The latter, in his first soldierly anguish over his defeat, would have resigned his command; but the Committee of Estates would not part with him. LIEUTENANT-GENERAL DAVID LESLIE, therefore, remained the military hope of the Scottish Government. (2) There was now, more visibly than before, a SUPER-ULTRA-PRESBYTERIAN PARTY. It consisted of all those opinionists who, more or less uneasy in their consciences from the first over the paction that had been made with Charles, had tried, just before Dunbar, to make the paction as inoffensive to the Deity as possible by procuring the purgation of Leslie's Army and the severest increase of Kirk-discipline for the young King himself. Dunbar was now their argument. Was it not clear that the Lord would never favour the Scots, in their enterprise for Charles, so long as there was the least touch of old Malignancy, or of the Hamilton Engagement of 1648, in their hearts or counsels? Representatives of this feeling were not wanting even in the Committee of Estates. Lord Warriston, young Swinton of Swinton, and four or five others, had been noted for some time, on this account, as uneasy members of Government. In the Commission of the Kirk, too, and among the clergy generally, there was a good deal of the same spirit. The mass of the older-fashioned clergy, indeed, with our friend Baillie among them, were for countenancing the Government in a moderate policy; but they were for the moment overborne by a faction of the younger clergy, led by Mr. James Guthrie of Stirling and Mr. Patrick Gillespie of Glasgow. In vain were such men denounced as disturbers of the national unity at an inconvenient time, or even as Cromwellians and friends of the invading English Sectaries. They retorted that, whatever they might be called, they were the champions of the genuine Presbyterianism of Scotland, the true standard-bearers of the Covenant. Actually, on the 12th of September, a few of them, meeting at Stirling as Commissioners of the Kirk, drafted and sent forth, in the name of that body, two documents embodying their peculiar views. One was *A Declaration and Warning to all Congregations*, the other a statement of *Causes of a Solemn Public Humiliation upon the Defeat of the Army*. In both there was the stereotyped reference to "the perfidious and blasphemous Sectaries"; but both were in effect a censure of the Government for inefficiency and mere carnal policy in their dealings with Charles, and on Charles himself for levity, impenitence, and hypocrisy. As the documents circulated, many of the clergy and of other moderate people repudiated them, and rebuked or regretted the officiousness of Messrs. Guthrie and Gillespie; but the scattered adherents of these leaders were, nevertheless, numerous. What made them most formidable was that they were abetted by nearly the whole population of those Western Shires, south of Glasgow, which had long been the seat of the most fervid Presbyterianism of Scotland, and whence had come that Whigamore Raid which had established the existing Government. In these, and especially through Lanarkshire, Renfrewshire, and Ayrshire, there were the sharpest criticisms of Leslie's conduct at Dunbar, and of the whole conduct of the Government back to the Treaty of Breda, with questionings whether the interests of the Scottish nation and those of Charles Stuart could now be combined on any conceivable terms. Nor were military leaders lacking in those parts. Besides a Colonel Gilbert Ker and others, there was that COLONEL ARCHIBALD STRACHAN who had so adroitly extinguished Montrose at Corbiesdale. He had been in Cromwell's English Army till the Battle of Preston and after; and, though he had been won back to Scotland and Presbyterianism, the Sectarian leaven could yet be detected in him. Though a native of Musselburgh on the East Coast, Strachan had cast in his lot now with the Western Whigs. (3) Apart from the Argyle Party of the central Government, and much more apart from the Super-Ultra-Presbyterian Party of the West, was THE PARTY OF MIXED OR MISCELLANEOUS ROYALISTS. It comprehended all those Old Royalists, of the Montrose persuasion or of any other, who were anxious to rally round Charles on any terms whatsoever, but were *hors de combat* as Malignants, and also all those more Presbyterian Royalists, represented now by the Duke of Hamilton and the Earl of Lauderdale, who were under later ban as having been Engagers in 1648. Eager to serve Charles, but disowned by the Argyle Government and by the Kirk, what were these Old Royalists and Engagers to do? To live dispersed in their several habitations and let things take their course was hard even for those of them who had not been ordered out of Scotland, as Hamilton and Lauderdale had been. They too wanted to fight against the invading Sectaries. Well, Scotland was large enough to afford them too a region for rendezvous. Besides the Central Region and the Western Shires, there was the Highland North, that wild land of licence and loyalty, where Montrose had begun his triumphs, and where the Kirk, with all her efforts, had not yet subdued, to any appreciable extent, the hills, the Gaelic, and the mists? Thither, accordingly, not a few of the debarred Scottish Royalists, with stray Englishmen among them, had betaken themselves, to be out of the range of the Argyle Government, and to be at the disposal of the Marquis of Huntley, the Earls of Athole and Seaforth, and the other chiefs of clans. Nor was this party either without its soldier in chief. He was MAJOR-GENERAL JOHN MIDDLETON, the son of a Kincardineshire laird, heard of for the last ten years in one capacity or another—first as an under-officer of Montrose in the early days of the Scottish Covenant, helping that nobleman to reduce the Prelatic Aberdonians, then as an officer of distinction in the English Parliamentarian Army, and latterly as in command in Leven's Scottish auxiliary army in England. From this last he had been detached as David Leslie's second in command to recover Scotland from Montrose; and, after helping to beat Montrose at Philiphaugh, he had been charged with the pursuit of Montrose into the

---

[1] Carlyle's Cromwell, II. 170—194, where there is the one full, grand, and ever memorable account of the Battle of Dunbar.

[2] Balfour, IV. 97; Carlyle's Cromwell, II. 204—216.

Highlands. A very conspicuous man in Scotland by these antecedents, he had joined the Engagement of 1648, and had been Major-General in the Duke of Hamilton's Army for invading England. Taken prisoner after the Battle of Preston, he had been confined for some time at Newcastle, but had made his escape, and returned to Scotland to lie under the disqualification and disgrace allotted by the Argyle Government and the Kirk to all Engagers. Impatient under such treatment, he had tried to make an independent career for himself, very much after Montrose's fashion, by promoting a bold rising for Charles II. in the Highlands, while the Argyle Government were slowly negotiating with his Majesty abroad; and it was only because the Government distinguished between a Middleton and a Montrose in such a matter that the offence had been condoned. And now again Major-General Middleton was in the Highlands, renewing the attempt, and forming a so-called Northern Band or Engagement, which was to include Huntley, Athole, Seaforth, the Ogilvies, and all Montrosists or Engagers that would join it.[1]

Between two such contrary winds of doctrine as Strachan's blast from the Western Shires and Middleton's from the North how did the Argyle Government at Stirling comport itself? At first, because the extreme Whig blast was yet the stronger, they yielded to *it*. The Western Shires were constituted into a separate military association, with promise that they should not be troubled by orders from Leslie; and on the 27th of September the Committee of Estates at Stirling issued a mandate for "purging of the King's family of all profane, scandalous, and disaffected persons," and consequently for removing from his Court at Perth twenty-two of his English attendants, including the Earl of Cleveland, Lord Wentworth, and Lord Wilmot. The Duke of Buckingham was permitted to remain. He had managed somehow, clever young dissolute as he was, to ingratiate himself with Argyle and Lorne.[2]

---

[1] The facts and hints for this account of the state of Scotland after the Battle of Dunbar have been gathered from various quarters. Balfour, IV. 98—139, Baillie, III. 110—130, and Blair's Life, 239—246, are among the authorities nearest to the actual occurrences; but see also Clarendon, 758—9, and Burnet, I. 98.

[2] Balfour, IV. 109—112; Blair's Life, 241—242; Burnet's *Own Time* (Oxford Ed. of 1823) I. 91.

But a sudden escapade of the King's own induced a change in the policy of the Government. Cut to the heart by this last insult of the removal of his English attendants, Charles had begun to ask himself whether it was worth while to be in Scotland at all on such wretched conditions. Argyle's guardianship, Presbyterian guardianship generally, was too severe to be endured. He had been led to fear also, by some about him, and especially by his physician Dr. Fraser, that he might be delivered up to the still sterner guardianship of Strachan and the Western Whigs. Overtures meanwhile had come to him from Middleton and the Party of the North. What more natural, in these circumstances, than that, having gone out hawking near Perth, with five of his grooms, on the afternoon of Friday, Oct. 4, he should make a run towards the protection of those Highland friends of his? For forty-two miles that day he rode in the direction that had been signalled to him, past Dundee, and so, under convoy of one or two noblemen and a band of Highlanders, to a glen among the Grampians. The arrangements for his reception, however, had been imperfect; and a single night's experience of a Highland hut broke down his courage. Early next morning, having been found by some alert friends of the Government lying half-awake "in a nasty room, on an old bolster, above a mat of seggs and rushes, overwearied and very fearful," he was easily persuaded to return; and on the 6th of October Argyle and the Committee of Estates, who had in the meantime been in great alarm, were relieved by his reappearance at Perth. He behaved with the penitence of a truant schoolboy, and threw all the blame on Dr. Fraser. But *The Start*, as it was called, though thus abortive, had done more for his Majesty than any other act of his since he had been in Scotland. Argyle and his Government had been awakened to the possibility, nay the certainty, of a conjunction of his Majesty with the Northern Royalists if they did not themselves conciliate him by gentler treatment. Accordingly, on Thursday, Oct. 10, four days after his return, Charles for the first time was admitted to a meeting of the Committee of Estates. "*King present*," writes Balfour, specially noting this sitting of the Committee "in his Majesty's Privy Chamber at Perth," and adding the names of the twenty-six Noblemen, Lairds, and Burgesses, who formed the rest of the *sederunt.* Chancellor Loudoun is named first after the King; then come the Marquis of Argyle, the Earls of Eglintoun, Cassilis, Lothian, Buccleuch, Roxburgh, and Tweeddale, and Lords Angus, Lorne, &c. The next day, at a much larger meeting, "*Dominus Rex*" was again present; and this time he even made a little speech. It was to the effect that he was sorry for "that late unhappy business" of his escapade, to which he had been led "by the wicked counsel of some men who had deluded him," but "he trusted in God it would be a lesson to him all the days of his life," and that for the rest, "in respect he was not a very good orator himself," the Chancellor would declare his mind more at length. Whereupon Lord Chancellor Loudoun did speak at very great length, Argyle saying little, but thinking much; and from that day the King was regularly present at Council meetings, and was otherwise King in all outward show.[1]

There was no longer any doubt now as to the policy of the Party of the Government. It was to be a policy of general conciliation, so as to unite round Charles all Scotchmen that would support his cause, whatever had been their antecedents, even should it be necessary for this purpose to repeal or neglect the famous "Act of Classes" of Jan. 1649, hitherto the very charter and fundamental statute of the Argyle Government (ante p. 21). To this, of course, there was no objection on the part of Middleton and the Northern Royalists: it was exactly what they wanted. They remained in arms, indeed, for some time, and even ran to arms more demonstratively after *The Start*, so that proclamations had to be made against them as "the Northern Rebels," and Leslie had to march towards them. In reality, however, there were shrewd negotiations all the while; and, Leslie having taken with him an Act of Pardon and Indemnity, the affair ended amicably in a Treaty at Strathbogie (Nov. 4).—Two of the national Parties having thus coalesced, how was it with the third or Super-Ultra-Prespyterian Party? It was as might have been expected. The King's *Start*, the cordiality of his welcome back to Perth after that offence, and the signs of the intended coalition with the Northern Royalists, had made them furious. In a meeting of the Commission of the Kirk at Stirling, Mr. James Guthrie had moved the summary excommunication of Middleton ; and, the motion having been carried by a majority of two or three votes, he had himself pronounced the sentence in his own church at Stirling next Sunday, notwithstanding an express from Perth entreating him to forbear. But that was not all. By Mr. Guthrie's instigation, in agreement with Mr. Patrick Gillespie, Lord Warriston, and the chiefs of the Western Whigs, there was drawn up at Dumfries, Oct. 17, and presented to the Committee of Estates at Stirling, Oct. 22, *A Remonstrance of the Gentlemen, Commanders, and Ministers, attending the Forces in the West.* It was a document of great length and in a very high strain. It demanded a suspension of Charles "till such time as there shall be convincing and clear evidence of a real change in him," the exemplary punishment of the Northern Malignants, and the conduct of the war against the English Sectaries on new principles thenceforward, if it were to be continued at all. The coalition with the Northern Royalists being yet incomplete, the Government received this Remonstrance with fair words at first; but no sooner was the Treaty made at Strathbogie than the tone changed. In conferences at Perth and Stirling between the Government and the Kirk-Commissioners, Argyle, Loudoun, Lothian, and others of the statesmen, with such kirkmen as Mr. Robert Douglas, Mr. James Wood, and Mr. Baillie, became more strenuous in advocating the policy of compromise and union, and in condemning the Remonstrance, against the sharp defences of Warriston and Messrs. Guthrie and Gillespie, and the milder arguments of Mr. Samuel Rutherford and Mr. James Durham.—In fact, from the middle of Nov. 1650, the rupture was decisive, and the Scots, for the rest of the war with Cromwell, had resolved themselves into two masses—the Coalition of the Central and Northern Royalists, managed by the Argyle Government, and upholding the standard of Charles and the Covenant together; and the Association of Remonstrants or Western Whigs, managed one hardly knows how, and with no standard meanwhile but the impersonal one of Super-Ultra-Presbyterianism or the Covenant in the absolute. Strachan, who would have been the fittest manager, had declared himself dissatisfied with the Remonstrance itself, as not strong enough; and he was tending, with others of the Remonstrants, directly to Cromwell.[1]

---

[1] Balfour, IV. 112—119; Baillie, III. 117; Blair's Life, 242—244.

If Cromwell had been rather inactive in the field since Dunbar, it had been precisely because, in his anxiety to avoid unnecessary bloodshed, he had been watching how far the dissensions among the Scots would themselves work for him. He had made a movement or two towards Stirling, and had corresponded with the Committee of Estates there; but his chief hopes had been from the Western Whigs. Their principles really interested him, despite their prejudices against himself; and, with a view to win them over, he had begun separate negotiations with them, and had even gone to Glasgow with his troops, and remained there, rather as a friendly visitor than an enemy, for two days (Oct. 18–20). The citizens were surprised that even the railings at him and his soldiers by some of the city-clergy from their pulpits could not put him out of temper. Drawn back to Edinburgh by information that the Western Colonels, then quartered farther south, had planned a march thither in his absence, he had still continued the negotiations, and all the more pressingly after he had seen the Western Remonstrance. At length, however, all efforts to treat having failed, he marched west again, advancing on the north side of the Clyde himself, while Major General Lambert, with 3000 horse, took the south side. It fell to Lambert to finish the business. He had reached Hamilton and taken up his quarters in that town, when Colonel Gilbert Ker, then the only effective commander of the Westland forces, resolved to make an "infall" upon him there with these forces alone, rather than wait for a sinful conjunction with Colonel Robert Montgomery, whom the Government at Stirling had despatched, with four or five regiments, to aid him or supersede him. It was on Sunday morning, Dec. 1, that the "infall" took place, with the result that Ker himself was wounded and taken prisoner, and his whole force shattered. Strachan and others having then openly joined Cromwell, the Western Association was at an end; and, the English rapidly extending themselves, south and west from Glasgow, and Edinburgh Castle having surrendered on the 24th of December, the whole of Scotland south of the Firths of Forth and Clyde was in Cromwell's possession. That portion of Scotland, in fact, was now a province of the English Commonwealth, and all that remained as the Scotland of Charles II. and his Government was the original kingdom of his ancestor Kenneth Macalpine, north of the Firths.[1]

---

[1] Balfour, IV. 129—160 (including the Western Remonstrance complete); Baillie, III. 118—122.

There the miscarriage at Hamilton, and the consequent loss of the West, had greatly facilitated matters. A Parliament having met at Perth on the 26th of November, the King's presence in the Committee of Estates had been changed into his more impressive presence in the States themselves, numbering at first fifteen Nobles, about twenty-seven Lairds or Commissioners of Shires, and about twenty Commissioners of Burghs, with Chancellor Loudoun as elected President. Few Remonstrants being present, there was little difficulty in confirming a severe condemnation of the Remonstrance already passed by the Committee of Estates (Nov. 25), in which it had been declared to be "dishonourable to the Kingdom," and "scandalous and injurious to his Majesty's person," and referred for farther censure to the Commission of the Kirk. There was little difficulty either in obtaining from a special meeting of that ecclesiastical body, called at Perth, Dec. 14, a Resolution of concurrence in the coalition policy of the Government. The query submitted by Parliament to the Kirk-Commission was "What persons are to be admitted to rise in arms and join with the forces of the Kingdom, and in what capacity, for defence thereof against the Army of Sectaries?" and, few of the Western or Remonstrant clergy being present, the answer was unanimously to the effect that the Government might, in the present emergency, relax the Act of Classes so as to admit to military employment those whom that Act had disqualified. In fact, even before this Resolution of the Kirk, the Act of Classes had become a dead letter. Old Malignants and Engagers, as they dropped in, or applied, one by one, were admitted into Parliament, or at least to the private councils of his Majesty. There were admitted in this way, among others, the Earls of Craufurd, Linlithgow, Callander, Seaforth, Athole, and Dunfermline, with Viscount Newburgh, and Lords Cranstoun, Montgomery, and Carnegie; and the admission of Hamilton and Lauderdale, restored to their honours by the repeal of all sentences against them, made the coalition signally complete. That the Earl of Cleveland, Lord Wentworth, and Lord Wilmot, were replaced in his Majesty's household, was a small matter: within reasonable limits, and with due attendance at sermons, his Majesty could now have or do whatever he pleased. And so, much miscellaneous business having been transacted, and old Leven and David Leslie exonerated from the blame of Dunbar, and new levies ordered, and the Army re-officered with a recklessness of the Act of Classes which alarmed even Loudoun, what remained but Charles's coronation? All preparations had been made for this too, including the exhibition for a whole month, on a table in the Parliament House, of the Crown of Robert Bruce and the rest of the ancient Scottish Regalia; and on Wednesday, the 1st of January, 1651, the coronation was celebrated, with every magnificence, at Scone. The Marquis of Argyle put the crown on Charles's head; and Mr. Robert Douglas, chief minister of Edinburgh, preached the Coronation-sermon. His text was 2 Kings xi. 12: "And he brought forth the King's "son and put the crown upon him and gave him the testi-"mony: and they made him King and anointed him; and "they clapped their hands, and said *God save the King.*" The testimony given in this case was that of the National Scottish Covenant and the Solemn League and Covenant; to both of which Charles again swore most solemnly, promising to maintain them, with Presbyterial Government, and the Westminster Assembly's Directory, Confession of Faith, and Catechisms, in Scotland for ever, to observe them in his own practice and family, and to assent to all acts and ordinances establishing them, or that might establish them, in his other dominions. At the taking of this oath by Charles, Mr. Douglas was most strict in his adjurations, reminding the young King of passages in the history of his grandfather, and quoting, among other texts, Nehemiah v. 13: "And I "shook my lap, and said, So God shake out every man from "his house, and from his labour, that performeth not this "promise; even thus be he shaken out and emptied. And "all the congregation said *Amen*, and praised the Lord." Charles heard all meekly and was probably very sincere. He was then twenty years and seven months old.[1]

---

[1] Carlyle's Cromwell, II. 217—244; Baillie, III. 124—125; Blair's Life, 249.

One might stop at the Coronation of Jan. 1, 1650–1; but a better stopping place is Sunday, Jan. 12. "This day," writes Balfour, "LIEUTENANT-GENERAL MIDDLETON was relaxed from "his excommunication, and did his penance in sackcloth in "Dundee Church, and COLONEL ARCHIBALD STRACHAN was "excommunicate and delivered to the Devil in the Church "of Perth by Mr. Alexander Rollock." The Kirk, it thus appears, had come round completely to the mood of the Government. Mr. James Guthrie, Mr. Patrick Gillespie, Mr. Samuel Rutherford, and the rest of the bold Remonstrants still held fast by their principles, and wrote and spoke for them bravely, but were in utter disfavour, and even in some danger; the Kirk Acts they had carried had been rescinded; and their more worldly-wise brethren, of the type of Douglas, David Dickson, James Wood, and the good Baillie, were in the ascendant. Scottish Church-History remembers to this day that split of the Scottish Presbyterian clergy, round Charles II., in 1650, into *The Resolutioners*, as those were called who acquiesced in the resolutions of the Parliament and Commission of the Kirk for suspending or disusing the Act of Classes, and the *Remonstrants* or *Protesters*, who raised their voices against the backsliding. The distinction, smile at it as we now may, was to descend in Scotland through a whole generation, bringing alternate comfort and discomfort, fame and infamy, to hundreds concerned, and to some of them death on the scaffold.[1]

---

[1] Balfour, IV. 167—229; Baillie, III. 125—129; Blair's Life, 250—256.

Again and again, since this Island divided itself into an England and a Scotland, it has happened, for several months together, that the real history of the part called England has lain in the part called Scotland. The latter half of the second year of the English Commonwealth was one of those periods. Returning now, therefore, to England herself, we have to note but one or two events of that half-year, not involved in what has been already told.

A delicate charge for the Commonwealth was that of the Princess Elizabeth (now called the Lady Elizabeth), and the Duke of Gloucester (now called Mr. Henry Stuart), the two children of the late King that had been left in England. By order of the Parliament they had been transferred from the care of the Earl of Northumberland to that of the Countess of Leicester, at Penshurst, with an allowance of £3000 a year for their maintenance, but with orders that there should be no recognition of Royal rank in their education or treatment. In July 1650, however, when the Scottish war was causing excitement in England, it was resolved to remove them beyond the reach of Royalist plotters. The Isle of Wight having been chosen for their residence, they had just arrived there, and the House was considering a further proposal to send the Lady Elizabeth, who was in ill health, to her sister, the Princess of Orange, in Holland, and at the same time to send Prince Henry to his brother in Scotland, allowing each £1000 a year, when news was received of the death of the poor young princess. She died at Carisbrook Castle, Sept. 8, 1650, in her fifteenth year, and was buried there. The boy, then ten years of age, remained in the Isle of Wight.[2]

The Foreign Powers with which, only or mainly, we have seen the Commonwealth yet attempting diplomatic intercourse were the United Provinces, the City of Hamburg, Portugal, and Spain. Account has now to be taken of some changes which occurred in the relations of the Commonwealth to each of these powers.

---

[1] Balfour, IV. 240; *Scots Worthies* (by Howie of Lochgoin), Lives of Guthrie, Warriston, Rutherford, Dickson, Baillie, &c.

[2] Commons Journals, May 24, 1649, and July 24 and Sept. 11, 1650.

In the case of the UNITED PROVINCES, the diplomatic question was bound up with the struggle going on between the two political parties into which the Dutch were divided among themselves. The Party of the Stadtholder, which was predominant in the States-General, and which had from the first favoured the cause of Charles II., had continued to do so even after the murder of Dorislaus. They had declined all transactions with Mr. Walter Strickland, the agent of the Commonwealth. The Republican Party, on the other hand, which prevailed in the two Provincial States of Holland and West Friesland, had hastened, after the murder of Dorislaus, to testify their abhorrence of that act, and had ever since paid every attention to Strickland, and urged the recognition of his agency by the States-General. At length, in May 1650, the States-General and the Stadtholder still standing out for Charles II., and abetting him in his Breda Treaty with the Scots, the two Provincial States of Holland and Friesland had consulted their own interests by accrediting to London a special Envoy of their own. He was a Gerard Schaep, styled by the English 'Lord Schaep.' Through the month of June 1650, when Cromwell was in London on his transit from Ireland to Scotland, there was a good deal of preliminary business of punctilio between Schaep and the Parliament and Council of State, ending with the ceremonious reception of Schaep in the House (June 11), and a cordial acknowledgment of his mission (June 18). Thus there were in London two distinct Envoys from the Dutch—Schaep, for the two States of Holland and West Friesland; and Joachimi, still lingering in his old character as ambassador for the States-General. When the Scottish war had really begun Parliament thought it time to put an end to that irregular arrangement. Strickland, having been recalled from the Hague, was thanked by the House for his able and difficult services there (Aug. 2); he and Schaep were asked to manage matters in London as well as they could between them; and Joachimi had his pass given him (Sept. 26), and took his departure. Thus the Commonwealth and the United Provinces had come to the point of open quarrel. Hardly had Joachimi returned to Holland, however, when an unexpected event there entirely changed the face of affairs. This was the death of the young Stadtholder, William II., Prince of Orange. He died at the Hague, Nov. 6, eight days before the birth of his only child, afterwards William III. of Great Britain and Ireland. The effect upon the United Provinces of the decease of this able and active young Prince at such a moment was little less than a Revolution. The power was at once transferred to the party with which he had been struggling. If any additional argument was required to induce an alteration then of the policy of the States-General in their relations with the English Commonwealth, it had been furnished by Cromwell's successes in Scotland. The battle of Dunbar had been heard of all over Europe. Had William of Orange survived, the United Provinces might have remained steady to the cause of Charles II. even after that event; but it had its full weight with the statesmen that had now come into power. In short, the change was such that the English Parliament and Council of State recovered hopes of that close alliance with the Dutch people, to end perhaps in some kind of union between the two Protestant and Commercial Republics for the control of all the rest of Europe, of which there had been already dreams in some minds, and which had been in view in the mission of Dorislaus. On the 23rd of January, 1650–51, after much consultation, it was resolved to send Strickland and Lord Chief Justice St. John, with unusual state, as joint Ambassadors-Extraordinary to the United Provinces. St. John, it appears, remembering Dorislaus, would have avoided the honour; but, on the 28th of January, it was determined by forty-two votes to twenty-nine that his excuses could not be accepted. It is believed that Cromwell had suggested the arrangement.[1]

---

[1] Thurloe, I. 113 et seq. (Letters of Strickland, &c.); Commons Journals of the days named; Parl. Hist. p. 1362; Whitlocke, Feb. 1, 1650—1; Godwin, III. 370—376.

At Hamburg things had remained very much as they were at the date of Milton's last letter, of date Jan. 4, 1649–50, to the Senate of that city, complaining of their continued unfriendliness. Through that winter, indeed, Hamburg had been a haunt of Montrose's adherents, in preparation for his descent upon Scotland; and, though Richard Bradshaw had been appointed agent for the Commonwealth at Hamburg on the 31st of January, he did not proceed thither till April, when Montrose was in the Orkneys, and Hamburg was consequently a safer place for an English envoy. Thenceforward Bradshaw's residence there had been of use, though there were still causes of complaint.[1]

Peculiarly interesting to the Commonwealth had been the mission of Mr. Charles Vane to Portugal, to treat with his Portuguese Majesty, and put an end to Prince Rupert's piracy on English shipping in Portuguese waters. Vane had gone on his mission with unusual advantages, for he had gone in Admiral Blake's fleet, and that Admiral ("Colonel" or "General" he was still called, for service at sea or on land was then very much the same thing) had ample instructions how he was to aid Mr. Vane's mission. Having landed Vane, late in March 1650, Blake waited outside the port of Lisbon to see the result. His Portuguese Majesty received Vane very politely, but naturally demurred when it was explained to him that the ships of Rupert's fleet, then in the Tagus, belonged to the English Commonwealth, that their crews were deserters and ruffians, and that Admiral Blake wanted to come in and take or destroy them, as by old treaties between England and Portugal he had a right to do. His Majesty, without making political distinctions, thought there were ships enough already in the Tagus, and could not allow more to enter, though he would be glad to show his respect for the Commonwealth by sending Admiral Blake provisions. Immediately Blake tried to force his way into the harbour, to get at Rupert's ships; but, the fire of the Portuguese forts making that impossible, he attended to the rest of his instructions. The chief dependence of Portugal then was her trade with her

---

[1] Order Books of Council of State, March 30 and April 4, 1650; Commons Journals, April 3 and May 21.

Brazil colonies; and the capture by Blake of five richly-laden vessels from Brazil, late in May, was the first intimation to the King of Portugal of the probable consequences of his protection of Rupert. Admiral Popham having been sent out to reinforce Blake, Vane's diplomacy was, in fact, superseded by *their* cannon, so that Vane, finding himself in danger in Lisbon, was glad to re-embark privately, and get back to England. He was there by the 4th of July, on which day he received the thanks of the House. For the next month or two Blake and Popham ranged at will between Portugal and Brazil, waylaying the outward-bound or homeward-bound fleets of the Portuguese, capturing nine ships at one time, eleven at another, and occasionally sinking a vessel of enormous value that would not be captured. The imprisonment of English merchants at Lisbon was the only form of reprisal open to the Portuguese Government. It was but a poor one, and Portugal was very miserable. It was easy to order Rupert to leave the Tagus and fight Blake; but, when he did go out to sea, and Blake was making ready for him, what could he do but come back for the shelter of the Portuguese batteries? At length, by some management, he did, some time in October, slip from the Portuguese coast and make his way into the Mediterranean, where he went about ravaging and burning stray English ships, till Blake came up with him. On the 21st of December it was known in England that Blake had fallen on Rupert's fleet off Malaga, and sunk, taken, or wrecked all his vessels, except two, which had escaped, with Rupert and his brother Maurice on board, and with Blake in chase. Exactly four days before (Dec. 17) Parliament had received a letter, dated from Southampton, addressed "*Parliamento Reipublicæ Angliæ,*" and subscribed "*Excellentiarum Vestrarum addictissimus Servitor et Amicus,* JOAO DE GUIMARAES." The Portuguese Government, it appeared, as soon as they had been relieved of Rupert's presence, had resolved to beg peace from the English Commonwealth, and had despatched this Guimaraes as their envoy. On Dec. 19, the House, considering his letter from Southampton, and also two he had sent to the Council of State, debated whether he should be received at all, and it was carried only by a majority of one to send him a safe-conduct. On the 27th of December, Guimaraes having arrived in London, and sent copies of his credentials to the Speaker, his audience was put off until a committee should report on the whole subject of the ceremonial to be observed by the Commonwealth in its reception of Foreign Ministers. That committee having reported, it was resolved on the 1st of January, 1650–1, that all full Ambassadors, Ordinary or Extraordinary, from Foreign States or Princes, should be admitted to audience of the House itself, but that ministers under the rank of Ambassadors should have audience only by a Committee of the House. Accordingly, as the credentials of Guimaraes did not nominate him as full ambassador, he was to be received in the inferior way. Guimaraes made some remonstrance; but the House adhered to its resolution, and he had to be content with the audience of a Committee, appointed Jan. 11, with Whitlocke for chairman. From that date to Feb. 4 there were meetings between Guimaraes and this Committee, with references to the Council of State, productions of letters from the King of Portugal, translations of these letters, and farther discussions of points of etiquette, all as preliminary to the real business. In these meetings Sir Oliver Fleming, Master of Ceremonies to the Commonwealth, performed a leading part, arranging the seats, introducing Guimaraes, and regulating the bowing, the covering and uncovering, and the other formalities. Mr. Charles Vane was, of course, called upon to assist; and Milton, we shall find, had also to give his particular attendance and services, though hardly so much at these preliminary meetings as afterwards when the real business began and the Council of State managed it. That, however, was not till the following year; and at the end of the second year of the Commonwealth on the 17th of February, 1650–1, Guimaraes was still a novelty in London, driving about with his Portuguese servants, and visited occasionally by Sir Oliver Fleming, bowing with his white wand.[1]

---

[1] Thurloe, I. 140—147; Commons Journals of the dates given, and of various other dates, traceable in the Index under *Portugal* and *Guimaraes;* Whitlocke, Dec. 21; Godwin, III. 357—369. Rupert and Maurice fled to the

The great incident in the year's intercourse with SPAIN had been the murder of Ascham at Madrid in the end of May. Obliged to take notice of that outrage, perpetrated as it had been by young English Royalists known to Hyde and Cottington, the Spanish Government had at first made it the occasion of a severe show of resentment. But, as Hyde himself tells us, he and Cottington knew the temper of the Spanish Court too well to be under any great apprehension. Very soon, in fact, all the diplomatic world at Madrid were in a state of condolence round Hyde and Cottington over the case of "the unhappy gentlemen" whose too rash loyalty had led them to murder Ascham, and Don Lewis de Haro, the Spanish Prime Minister himself, was privately assuring Hyde "I envy those gentlemen for having done so noble an action, "how penal soever it may prove to them." In these circumstances it was not likely to prove very penal; and, one by one, the assassin-heroes escaped, all except one, who was a Protestant, and whose execution was therefore a trifle. And so for a while matters continued, the protests from England, conveyed in the thunder of Milton's Latin, passing unheeded, and Hyde and Cottington aware of a distinct increase of respect to them, after it was known that Charles had landed in Scotland and was actually in possession of some kind of Kingdom. Then, however, there came the rumour of Dunbar, and at the same time a little experience by Spain herself of Blake's prowess at sea. In his quest of Rupert, it mattered little to Blake whether it was the Portuguese or Spanish flag, or even the French itself, that he found opposing him, and his orders allowed him considerable discretion. In short, before the end of the year, Spain, as well as Portugal, found it convenient to be at peace with the English Commonwealth. Hyde and Cottington were informed one morning that they had been more than a year in Madrid and that their longer stay was undesirable; and at the same time instructions were sent to

---

West Indies; whence Rupert returned, after some time, with his two vessels, and sold them to Cardinal Mazarin. Maurice was drowned somewhere in the West Indian Seas; but the exact time and place do not seem to be known. As late as May 12, 1653, Rupert, then in France, is reported by Whitlocke as "very sad that he could hear nothing of his brother Maurice."

Alonzo de Cardenas, who had never left his post as Spanish ambassador in London, to begin the most cordial negotiations on the part of Philip IV. Copies of the credentials of Cardenas were produced in Parliament on the 24th of December, just a week after the Portuguese Envoy Guimaraes had applied for an audience; and on the 26th Cardenas, as full ambassador, had that public audience with the whole House which could not be granted to a mere envoy like Guimaraes. Through the next month, it is enough to add, the Spanish Ambassador's coach divided the attention of the Londoners with the Portuguese Envoy's chariot, and the Envoy was wild with jealousy at the superior honours accorded to the Ambassador, and Sir Oliver Fleming with his white wand had to proportion his obeisances as exquisitely as possible between the Spaniard and the Lusitanian. There was to be work for Milton from the Embassy of Cardenas, as well as from the mission of Guimaraes.[1]

At the close of the second year of the Republic was there any nearer prospect of the convocation of a new Parliament? Throughout the year the attendance in the House had been still so small as to justify the nickname of THE RUMP now fastened on it by the Royalists. The records of divisions in the Journals show only on one occasion an attendance of as many as ninety-eight, but several times an attendance as low as thirty-six or thirty-seven, the average attendance being between forty and fifty-five. Could there not now be a dissolution? That prospect seemed to to be no nearer. The Grand Committee on Elections had, indeed, sat weekly from Feb. 27 to August 14, and had again resumed its sittings on Oct. 23, but with no effective result. The child Moses, though two years old, was not yet strong enough to be given over to a new nurse. And so, on the 5th of February, 1650–1, without any offer at a dissolution of itself, the House began the business of electing the new

---

[1] Clarendon, 748—754; Godwin, III. 365—369; Commons Journals of Dec. 20 and Dec. 26, 1650, and of subsequent dates through January, traceable in the Index sub voce *Cardenas*. Cottington died at Valladolid in 1651, aged seventy-seven, in the full Catholic faith.

Council of State. It was then resolved that the Council for the next year should consist of forty-one members, and that twenty of these should be new men; and on the 7th and 10th the twenty-one old members to be retained, and the twenty new ones to be added, were chosen by ballot, ratified in each case by open vote. In the ballot of the 7th, there were 116 voting-papers, the election having attracted by far the largest House of the whole year.[1]

---

[1] Commons Journals and Parl. Hist. for days named; and Records of Divisions in Commons Journals throughout the year.

CHAPTER IV.

MILTON'S LIFE AND SECRETARYSHIP FROM FEB. 1649–50 TO FEB. 1650–51.

EXTRACTS FROM THE COUNCIL ORDER BOOKS RELATING TO MILTON, WITH NOTICES OF NEEDHAM, DUGARD, DURIE, HARTLIB, HAAK, HUGH PETERS, AND OTHERS: TWELVE OF MILTON'S LATIN STATE-LETTERS (NOS. VI–XVII): MRS. POWELL'S SUIT FOR RECOVERY OF THE FAMILY PROPERTY, AND MILTON'S INTEREST IN THE SAME: HIS PETITION AND AFFIDAVIT AS TO HIS WHEATLEY ESTATE: SECOND AND ENLARGED EDITION OF THE *EIKONOKLASTES:* SPECIMENS OF THE NEW MATTER: *PRO POPULO ANGLICANO DEFENSIO CONTRA SALMASIUM:* CIRCUMSTANCES OF ITS PREPARATION: ACCOUNT OF THE BOOK, WITH ILLUSTRATIVE EXTRACTS: ITS TREMENDOUS PERSONALITIES: SALMASIUS NOW AT STOCKHOLM: QUEEN CHRISTINA OF SWEDEN AND HER COURT.

As before, the reader is entitled to see the authentic particulars of Milton's official life this year, exactly as they stand in the Order Books of the Council of State. The following are the entries in those Order Books, between Feb. 17, 1649–50 and Feb. 17, 1650–1, in which his name is mentioned, or in which he was implicated:—

Monday, Feb. 18, 1649–50. *Present:* Col. Purefoy, Sir Wm. Armyn, Mr. Bond, Sir Gilbert Pickering, Mr. Marten, Serjeant Bradshaw, Sir Henry Vane, Colonel Jones, Lord Grey of Groby, Mr. Wallop, Lord Chief Baron Wylde, Sir W. Masham, Sir Arthur Hasilrig, Sir Henry Mildmay, Mr. Heveningham, Mr. Scott, Mr. Holland, the Earl of Denbigh, Colonel Popham, Col. Hutchinson:— *Inter alia,* ordered, "That Mr. Milton, Secretary for Foreign "Languages, Serjeant Dendy, Serjeant-at-arms, Mr. Frost the "younger, assistant to Mr. Frost the Secretary, and all the Clerks "formerly employed under Mr. Frost, as also the messengers and "all other officers employed by the Council last year and not dis-"missed, shall be again entertained into the same employments, and "shall receive the same salary which was appointed them the year "past."—On the same day a Letter was despatched by the Council of State to the Commissioners of Customs, informing them that copies of the *Defensio Regia* of Salmasius were on their way from Holland to several booksellers in England, and instructing them to order their subordinate officers of Customs to see to the discovery and seizure of all such copies, that the importers might be proceeded against.[1]

Saturday, Feb. 23. Present: Bradshaw as Lord President, Lord Howard of Escrick, Col. Purefoy, Mr. Scott, Sir W. Constable, the Earl of Salisbury, Sir W. Masham, Mr. Jones, Sir Gilbert Pickering, Sir H. Mildmay, the Earl of Denbigh, Mr. Holland, Mr. Stapley, Mr. Challoner, Mr. Heveningham, Viscount Lisle, Sir W. Armyn, Alderman Pennington, Mr. Bond, Sir H. Vane, Chief Baron Wylde:—"*Memorandum:* That Mr. John Milton, Secretary for the Foreign "Languages, Mr. Edward Dendy, Serjeant-at-arms, and Mr. Gualter "Frost the younger, assistant to the Secretary, did this day take the "Engagement following: 'I, being nominated by this Council to "'be .... for the year to come, do promise in the sight of God that, "'through his grace, I will be faithful in the performance of the "'trust committed to me, and not reveal or disclose anything, in "'whole or in part, directly or indirectly, that shall be debated or "'resolved upon in the Council, and ordered to be kept secret by "'the said Council, without the command, direction, or allowance, "'of the Parliament or Council.'"

Saturday, March 30, 1650. Present: Bradshaw, Jones, Colonel Morley, Lord Commissioner Lisle, Vane, Challoner, Gurdon, Stapley, Armyn, Holland, Bond, Lord Howard, Scott, Skippon, Masham, Hasilrig, the Earl of Salisbury, Viscount Lisle, and Walton. *Ordered:* "That the Instructions now read, to be given to Mr. "Richard Bradshaw, with the amendments proposed, be fair written "and delivered unto him; That it be recommended to the Lords "Commissioners of the Great Seal to give order for the preparing "of a Commission for Mr. Richard Bradshaw, who is to be employed "Resident from this Commonwealth to the Senate of Hamburg, "according to the order of Parliament; That a credential Letter be "likewise prepared for him by Mr. Milton." (See ante p. 126 and p. 217). Milton, it appears from a subsequent minute, submitted his draft of a credential letter for Bradshaw at the Council meeting of Monday, April 1; when it was read and approved.

Tuesday, April 2. (1) "*Memorandum:* Mr. Milton to have "warning to meet the Lords Commissioners Whitlocke and Lisle at

---

[1] The information in the latter part of this paragraph is from Mrs. Green's Calendar for 1650, p. 2.

"the Parliament door at ten of the clock tomorrow morning." This, I imagine, is a jotting by Secretary Frost, to keep himself in mind that, in consequence of what had happened at the Council that day, he must send a message to Milton as soon as the Council rose. That it was on the business of the credential letter to Bradshaw that Milton's attendance at the Parliament door was required is proved by one of the minutes of that day's sitting of Council, and also by the following entry in the Commons Journals of next day:—"*Ordered*, That warrants be granted to the Lords "Commissioners of the Great Seal to seal the Commission granted "to the Agent for Hamburg, and that Mr. Speaker do sign the "same accordingly." (2) On the same day it was ordered by the Council that MR. DUGARD should have his printing-press restored to him, on recognisance that he would not employ it to the prejudice of the Commonwealth, and on payment of a sum to be fixed by Sir James Harrington, Sir William Masham, and Mr. Scott. (See ante p. 152.)

Tuesday, April 30. Present: Bradshaw, Vane, Mildmay, Chief Baron Wylde, Hutchinson, Challoner, Walton, Morley, Scott, Pennington, Gurdon, the Earl of Salisbury, Bond, Henry Marten, Ludlow, Constable, and Jones:—"That Mr. Chambers in the Gate-"house be released upon his own engagement, and twenty nobles "given him for his relief."—My reason for quoting this entry is that I thought I recognised it, in the Scroll Order Book of Council, as being in Milton's own handwriting,—the only scrap in the whole series of the Order Books that I could so distinguish. Who Mr. Chambers was, the order for whose release from the Gatehouse seems recorded by so honourable a hand, I cannot tell. Was he the Mr. Richard Chambers of London, so famous long ago for his courageous resistance to Laud and the Star-Chamber (Vol. I. p. 339, and Vol. II. pp. 175, 176), and who had recently been discharged from his office of Alderman, disqualified for any trust in the Commonwealth, and handed over to a Committee of Parliament for farther prosecution, on account of his concern with other Aldermen in refusal to proclaim the abolition of the Kingly office and in other acts of Presbyterian contempt (Commons Journals, May 31, and June 1 and 12, 1649)? Whoever he was, by some accident, such as Mr. Frost's having gone to the door for a moment and given Mr. Milton his pen, it fell to Milton, if I am not mistaken, to jot down this entry regarding him in the Council Order Book.

Monday, May 6:—"Ordered, That MR. MILTON do attend the "Lords Commissioners of the Great Seal with the papers given in "by Dr. Walsall concerning the goods of *Felones de se;* to whom "it is referred to take such course therein, for the advantage of the "Commonwealth, as they shall think fit."[1]

---

[1] I had missed this entry in my own examination of the Order Books; and I take it from Todd (Life of Milton in Vol. I. of the 1852 edition of the Poetical Works, p. 77).

Wednesday, May 15:—Ordered that a certain person brought to town by Cornet Joyce be searched by Mr. Serjeant Dendy, and that his trunks be brought in and thoroughly searched by MR. MILTON, who is to report tomorrow what he finds in them.[1]

Friday, May 24. Present: Bradshaw, Jones, Holland, Vane, Bond, Walton, Sir Peter Wentworth, Purefoy, Constable, Mildmay, Masham, Stapley:—"That £100 per annum be paid by Mr. Frost "quarterly unto MR. MARCHAMONT NEEDHAM, as a pension "whereby he may be enabled to subsist whilst he endeavours the "service of the Commonwealth, and this to be done for one year by "way of probation.—That £50 be paid unto Mr. Needham by Mr. "Frost, as a gift unto him from this Council for his service already "done to the Commonwealth." This means that Needham, who had been released from Newgate six months before, probably by Milton's intercession (ante pp. 149, 150, and p. 156), was willing, after his two or three years of scurrilous journalism for the Royalists, to turn journalist for the Commonwealth. His "service already done "to the Commonwealth," for which he was to receive £50, must have been a pamphlet of 94 pages, which he had published on the 8th of May, just a fortnight before this vote of reward for it. It was entitled *The Case of the Commonwealth of England stated: or the Equity, Utility, and Necessity of a submission to the present Government, cleared, out of monuments both sacred and civil, against all the scruples and pretences of the opposite parties, viz. Royalists, Scots, Presbyterians, Levellers, &c. Two Parts, with a Discourse of the Excellency of a Free State above a Kingly Government. By Marchamont Needham, Gent.* In the Preface, addressed "to the "Reader," Needham says, "Perhaps thou art of an opinion contrary "to what is here written: I confess that for a time I myself was so "too, till some causes made me reflect with an impartial eye upon "the affairs of the new Government"; and he adds, "I know the "high talkers, the lighter and censorious part of the people, will "shoot many a bitter arrow to wound my reputation and charge "me with levity and inconsistency." The pamphlet itself is rather quiet and serious, without any of the ribaldry or wit to be expected from the late editor of *Mercurius Pragmaticus*. These lighter qualities, however, Needham was reserving for another journal which he had projected, and for the editorship of which, in fact, the Council of State had voted him the pension of £100 a year, for one year certain, besides the immediate gift of £50. On the 13th of June, 1650, or three weeks after the date of the present entry, there appeared the first number of this new weekly paper, with the title of *Mercurius Politicus*. The appearance of the new paper and the contents of the first number are thus chronicled by a Royalist contemporary. "Now appeared in print as the weekly champion "of the new Commonwealth, and to bespatter the King [Charles II.]

---

[1] I had missed this entry also, and I take the abstract of it from Mrs. Green's Calendar for 1650, p. 163.

"with the basest of scurrilous raillery, one Marchamont Needham, "under the name of *Politicus*, a Jack-of-all-sides, transcendently "gifted in opprobrious and treasonable droll, and hired therefore "by Bradshaw to act the second part to his starched and more "solemn treason; who began his first diurnal with an invective "against Monarchy and the Presbyterian Scotch Kirk, and ended "it with an Hosanna to Oliver Cromwell, who in the beginning of "June returned by the way of Bristol from Ireland to London." Though the allowance to Needham of £100 a year (equal to about £350 now) was only for a year at first, "by way of probation," he did such good service that his editorship of *Mercurius Politicus* became one of the fixed institutions of the Commonwealth Government. Milton, we shall find, had something to do with it.

Friday, June 14. Present: Bradshaw, Pickering, Walton, Lord Howard, Sir P. Wentworth, the Earl of Denbigh, Lord Commissioner Lisle, Stapley, Gurdon, Bond, Masham, Purefoy, Mildmay:—"That "MR. MILTON shall have a warrant to the Trustees and Contractors "for the sale of the King's goods for the furnishing of his lodging "in Whitehall with some hangings." The warrant was issued four days afterwards, thus: "To the Trustees and Contractors for the "sale of the late King's goods: These are to will and require you "forthwith, upon sight hereof, to deliver unto MR. JOHN MILTON, "or to whom he shall appoint, such hangings as shall be sufficient "for the furnishing of his lodgings in Whitehall. Given at White-"hall 18 Junii 1650."

Saturday, June 22:—"That MR. MILTON do go to the Com-"mittee of the Army, and desire them to send to this Council the "book of Examinations taken about the risings in Kent and Essex." These must have been the risings in the second Civil War, ended by Fairfax's siege of Colchester, Aug. 1648.

Tuesday, June 25:—"That MR. MILTON do peruse the Examina-"tions taken by the Committee of the Army concerning the insur-"rections in Essex, and that he do take heads of the same, to "the end the Council may judge what is fit to be taken into "consideration." This means, as I interpret, that the Council anticipated that the war with Scotland then about to begin might give occasion to new risings among the English Royalists, and that they thought hints for precautions against these might be obtained from a study of the evidence taken respecting the previous risings in Essex and Kent.—The interpretation of the entry is confirmed by the fact that on the same day the Council issued warrants for the search of Prynne's study and chambers in Lincoln's Inn, and for the apprehension of Prynne himself and his committal to close custody in Dunster Castle in Somersetshire "for his seditious "writings and practices against the Commonwealth." The Council

---

[1] Needham's *Case of the Commonwealth stated;* Thomason, for the date of its appearance; Wood's Ath. III. 1184—5, where the quotation describing the first number of *Mercurius Politicus* is taken from Heath's Chronicle.

thus at last took notice of some ten or twelve recent pamphlets of Prynne, among the latest of which was his *Arraignment, Conviction, and Condemnation of the Westmonasterian Juncto's Engagement.* Even from his prison in Dunster Castle he contrived to issue (Sept. 1650) a tract against the Invasion of Scotland.[1]

Wednesday, June 26:—"That the Declaration of the Parliament "be translated into Latin by MR. MILTON, into Dutch by Mr. Haak, "and into French by Monsieur Augier." This was the Declaration of the Causes of the War with the Scotch (ante p. 192). "Monsieur "Augier" was René Augier, a naturalized Frenchman, who had been Parisian agent for the Parliament from Nov. 1644 till the end of 1649, when he had been recalled.

Monday, Aug. 5:—"That MR. JOHN DURIE shall have liberty "to stay within the Commonwealth of England." This is repeated Aug. 21, when the same privilege is accorded to other Scots, e. g. Alexander Burnett, Henry Wells, minister in Suffolk, and Henry Cunningham, minister of Northfleet in Kent—all on surety given that they would not do anything prejudicial to the State. The Council had their eye specially on the celebrated Durie, as a man who might be of use, both by his abilities, and by the multiplicity of his European connexions. He had just proved his readiness to serve the Commonwealth by publishing a tract called *Objections against the Taking of the Engagement answered* (date of publication, Aug. 3, in Catalogue of Thomason Collection).

Wednesday, Aug. 14:—Ordered: "That Mr. Thomas Goodwin, "Mr. Byfield, Mr. Bond, Mr. Nye, Mr. Durie, Mr. Frost, MR. "MILTON, or any three of them, of which Mr. Frost or MR. MILTON "to be one, be appointed to view and to inventory all the records, "writings, and papers whatsoever, belonging to the Assembly of the "Synod, to the end they may not be embezzled, and may be forthcoming for the use of the Commonwealth." This is an interesting entry.[2] Might not the Scots, who now denounced the English as a nation of Sectaries, be of opinion that all the documents of the Westminster Assembly belonged rightly to them, or would be in better custody with them in the meantime; and might they not even try to give effect to that opinion by obtaining possession of them, or of some of them? Whatever the Council of State might now think of the proceedings of the Westminster Assembly, this could not be allowed. Hence the order to the Committee, consisting, it will be observed, of five members of the Assembly in whom the Council could now trust, together with the Council's own two Secretaries, one of whom was always to be present. One wonders whether Milton did look over the records of the Assembly. If he did, he may have come upon traces among them of that execration with which the Reverend body had regarded himself on account of his Divorce heresy and his anti-Presbyterian invectives. There must have been references to him by name in some of the Assembly's more private documents, though none such have been found in the Assembly's preserved public Minutes.

---

[1] Wood's Ath. III. 865—866.

[2] I take it from Todd's Milton, edit. 1852 (I. 78). It had escaped my own scrutiny of the Order Books.

Saturday, Aug. 17:—"That £50 be paid by Mr. Frost to MR. "THEODORE HAAK, and so much also to MR. SAMUEL HARTLIB, "in regard of the many good services by them done by their cor-"respondency in parts beyond the seas, and to enable them to "continue it."—The two foreigners, it would appear, were of particular use, about this time, in procuring intelligence from abroad, and were often about the Council. From a later entry (Aug. 31) I gather that the unorthodox MR. CANNE, late of Amsterdam (Vol. II. p. 578), sometimes gave the Council valuable foreign information.

Saturday, Sept. 7:—"That, when the propositions shall be pre-"sented to this Council concerning the Reforming of Schools, the "Council doth declare that they will receive them and give them "all possible furtherance." Was Hartlib at work here, and was Milton abetting him? That very day news had been received of the Battle of Dunbar, and this item of business is mixed with the congratulations of the Council over that event.

Thursday, Sept. 12.—Present: Bradshaw, Armyn, Jones, Viscount Lisle, Commissioner Lisle, Stapley, Bond, Lieutenant-General Ludlow, Morley, Harrington, and Wentworth:—"That it be referred "to the Committee for the affairs of Ireland to send for Mr. Owen "and Mr. Caryl, or any other such ministers as they shall think fit, "and confer with them concerning their going into Scotland, accord-"ing to the desire of the Lord General; and they are likewise to "consider of what encouragement is fit to be given unto such as shall "be willing to go thither." This desire of Cromwell's to have some good English Independent ministers with him in Scotland, to help him in reasoning with the Scottish clergy, led to changes in the Chaplaincy to the Council. Owen and Caryl did at once go to Scotland (Commons Journals, Sept. 13); and, as STERRY was thus left sole Chaplain, the Council conjoined with him MR. HUGH PETERS (Dec. 17), arranging that he should do duty till Owen's return, receiving the same salary as Owen, after which he was to be provided for in some other way. Owen, notwithstanding his absence, was to be in receipt of his chaplain's salary as before (Order Book, Jan. 21, 1650–1).

Tuesday, Oct. 15:—"That MR. NEEDHAM do put into Latin the "Treatise which he hath written in answer to a Spanish piece "written in defence of the murder of Mr. Ascham."

Monday, Oct. 28:—"That MR. JOHN DURIE be appointed "Library Keeper of the Books in St. James's, and also of all "the Medals there, and that he have the lodgings belonging to that "place; and he is to take an inventory of the Books, Manuscripts, "and Medals therein, and present it to the Council." The Council had tried to retain poor MR. PATRICK YOUNG, the learned librarian to the late King (ante p. 147); but he had apparently been found too old for the post, and now a younger Scotchman was appointed in his place. Many of the Books and Medals were missing, and an energetic Librarian was needed. From a subsequent entry (Dec. 31) it appears that Young petitioned for some retiring allowance.

Saturday Nov. 16:—"That Mr. Challoner be desired to take "care that the study and papers of Mr. Thomas May be secured for "the use of the Parliament, and that Mr. Challoner be desired to "peruse his papers, that such of them as he shall think fit may be "preserved for the use of the State; That Mr. Challoner and Mr. "Marten be desired to take care for the interment of Mr. Thomas "May in such convenient place as the south side of the quire in "the Cathedral of Westminster, and that some convenient monu"ment be set up for him, the whole charge not exceeding £100, "the money to be paid by Mr. Frost . . . That Mr. Challoner, "Mr. Marten, and Sir James Harrington be appointed to consider "of some fit person who may carry on the writing of the History of "the Parliament."—May, known as a poet and a dramatist from the beginning of the reign of Charles I. (Vol. I. pp. 403–4), had been better known of late as Secretary to the Parliament, and his *History of the Long Parliament,* bringing down events to the close of the First Civil War, had been published by command of the two Houses early in 1647. He had died suddenly, Nov. 13, 1650, at the age of fifty-five; and the Commonwealth authorities were anxious not only to do honour to his memory by a modest funeral in Westminster Abbey, but also to secure anything he had left towards a continuation of his History, and to put the not unimportant work of that continuation into fit hands. Was Milton thought of? If so, he must have declined; for, as late as Jan. 1, 1650–1, the Committee, with Sir Peter Wentworth added, were again urged by the Council to report on the subject.

Monday, Dec. 23.—Present: Bradshaw, Masham, Morley, Stapley, Lord Chief Justice St. John, the Earl of Salisbury, Robinson, Armyn, Marten, Gurdon, Lord Chief Baron Wylde, Holland, Lord Chief Justice Rolle, Purefoy, Lord Howard, Wentworth, and Hutchinson:—*Ordered* "That MR. MILTON do print the Treatise "he hath written in answer to a late Book written by Salmasius "against the Proceedings of the Commonwealth." This is the answer to the *Defensio Regia* of Salmasius, which Milton had been instructed to prepare nearly twelve months before (ante p. 151), and which was now at last ready. We have here only to note the fact.

Thursday, Jan. 16, 1650–1:—"That it be referred to the Com"mittee for Whitehall to consider (upon the list given in to this "Council of such persons as do now inhabit within Whitehall) who "are fit to be discharged from abiding within the house any longer; "and they are likewise to certify by a list who they are that are "to remain." This might affect Milton's domestic arrangements.

Lodgings in Whitehall were naturally in demand among people who thought they had a right to that privilege; and, as a good many of the Council of State had quartered themselves there, and apartments had besides been assigned to Mr. Secretary Frost, Mr. Secretary Milton, Messrs. Sterry and Peters, and one knows not how many more, it was found desirable to revise the list of persons so accommodated and weed out those that had the least claim. The matter, we shall find, was one of great difficulty.

Monday, Feb. 10.—Present: Bradshaw, Scott, Constable, Lord Grey of Groby, Bond, Staples, Armyn, Masham, Vane, Heveningham:—*Ordered:* "That the way of treating with the Public "Minister of Portugal be by a Committee of the Council, consisting "of such a number as the Council shall think fit in reference to the "quality of the said Minister.—That the said Committee shall "receive the papers offered by the Public Minister to be presented "to the Council, and shall deliver such papers from the Council to "the Public Minister as shall first be resolved on by the Council "and shall be signed by Mr. Frost; and they shall have liberty, in "their debates, to prosecute and make good by argument the re- "solutions of the Council, and observe such method in their pro- "ceedings upon the Treaty as the Council shall direct them.—That "the place where the Committee shall treat with the said Public "Minister be the Great Chamber at the end of the Council Chamber, "and the time Wednesday in the afternoon at three of the clock.— "That Charles Vane, Esq., the Parliament's agent to Portugal, be "desired to be present at the said Committee at their meetings, and to "give his assistance in this treaty.—That MR MILTON, the Secretary "for Foreign Tongues, be appointed to attend the Committee at their "meetings; and that Joseph Frost [another son of Secretary Frost, "now attached to the office at £50 a year] be employed for such "writing as the Committee shall have occasion for on this business." —The important treaty with the Portuguese envoy Guimaraes (ante p. 219) had been handed over by the Parliament to the Council; and the Council, imitating the punctiliosity of Parliament, had resolved to negotiate with Guimaraes through a Committee of their number only, with Mr. Charles Vane and Milton in attendance.

Such are the particles of Milton's Biography from Feb. 18, 1649–50 to Feb. 17, 1650–1, contained in the Order Books of the Council of State. They exhibit him as still employed by the Council in a good deal of miscellaneous work, apart from that correspondence with Foreign Powers which was the proper duty of his Secretaryship. They do not sufficiently represent, however, all that he had done throughout the year in this last department; and, to make good the defect, we must turn to his own collection of his Latin Letters of State. Instructions to write a dispatch would be matter of routine now for Milton, not needing to be always minuted.

Milton has preserved twelve of his Dispatches of this year, one or two signed by Bradshaw as President of the Council, but most of them by Speaker Lenthall in the name of the Parliament, after they had been prepared and approved by the Council. The following is an abstract of them :—

(VI.) TO JOHN IV., KING OF PORTUGAL, *Feb.* 24, 1649–50 [1] :—This was a sequel to the letter of Feb. 4 of the same month introducing the English Envoy, MR. CHARLES VANE, to his Portuguese Majesty (ante p. 161); and it was probably sent after Vane, to be taken out by him, with that former letter, in Blake's fleet. It complains more strongly than that letter had done of the piracies of Rupert and his Fleet of Deserters off the Portuguese coasts; it demands the expulsion of the pirates from Portuguese territory and harbourage; and it requests the King not to receive any "pretended ambassadors from Charles Stuart."

(VII.) TO THE MOST SERENE PRINCE LEOPOLD, ARCHDUKE OF AUSTRIA, GOVERNOR OF THE [SPANISH] PROVINCES IN BELGIUM UNDER KING PHILIP : *March* 28, 1650 :—This is an appeal for the redress of a private injury. A certain Jane Puckering, described as a girl under age, and a wealthy heiress, had been forcibly seized at Greenwich, where she was residing, carried on board a ship, and taken to Flanders, all by the contrivance of one Walsh, who was desperately fond of her, or of her money, and had been trying to compel her to marry him by threats against her life. There had been messages at once to the Governors of Ostend and Nieuport; and the girl had meanwhile been put, for safety, into a nunnery. Walsh, however, to get possession of her, had begun a suit in the Ecclesiastical Court of the Bishop of Ypres, alleging a matrimonial contract. This letter was but to urge the request already made to his Highness through the English agent at Brussels. Both Walsh and the young heiress were English subjects; let Walsh come over to England and try his claim to be her husband in an English law-court. Meanwhile let the girl be sent back. "This not we "alone, as ready on any possible opportunity to return your "Highness a like favour and service, but Humanity itself, and "the very chivalry in defence of the honour and purity of that "sex which ought to be found in all good and brave men, seem "with united prayers to beseech of you. Farewell." [2] The appeal seems to have been successful; for the case of Jane Puckering, "daughter and heiress of Sir Thomas Puckering, Knight and Baronet," came before Parliament later in the year on petition from herself (Commons Journals, Nov. 1), when a resolution was come to for an Act applicable to such cases generally.

---

[1] Date from Skinner Transcript: undated in Printed Collection.

[2] From Mrs. Green's Calendar for 1650, pp. 53, 54, I find that Mr. Frost had been instructed by the Council (March 21) to prepare a letter to the Archduke on behalf of "Mrs. Puckering." Milton's may be but a translation of Frost's English.

(VIII.) To THE HAMBURGERS, *April* 2, 1650:—This is the credential letter of MR. RICHARD BRADSHAW to the Hamburg Senate, resolved on by the Council of State three days before (ante p. 224). It refers to former letters to the Hamburgers; but admits that mere letters are unsatisfactory, and hopes that Mr. Bradshaw will be honourably received, and that his personal agency will be useful. It stigmatizes also "certain seditious persons sent into your City by Charles Stuart" to harass the loyal English merchants. Montrose was then in the North of Scotland; and these must have been friends of his, left at Hamburg.

(IX.) To JOHN IV., KING OF PORTUGAL: *April* 27, 1650:—Blake had arrived at Lisbon, and landed Mr. Charles Vane, whose reception by his Portuguese Majesty had been so far satisfactory that it was not yet known in England that Blake had begun to take rougher measures to get at Rupert (ante pp. 217, 218). Still Admiral Popham was going out with another fleet to aid Blake in case of accidents; and he was to take this letter of introduction with him. It thanked King John for his favourable reception of Vane, and explained again that the sole purpose of his and Blake's mission was to recover the ships belonging to the English Commonwealth. Doubtless by this time the Portuguese have had sufficient experience of Rupert and his men; but the English Government think it right again to request his Majesty to eject the ruffians from his dominions, or, if he cannot do that, at least to let Popham into the Tagus.

(X.) To PHILIP IV., KING OF SPAIN: *April* 27, 1650[1]:—This letter was also to be taken out by Admiral Popham. "As, not so long "after the recovery of English liberty and the restitution, by divine "help, of the Commonwealth, it was decreed by the Supreme States "in Parliament, and also published by edict, that the English People "wishes and much desires, and will endeavour as far as lies in its "power, to preserve whatever friendship, of ancient date or recent, "it may have with certain foreign nations, or even, if necessary, to "renew the same by fresh Treaty, and as the same supreme authority "of Parliament resolved, for the repressing of pirates now infesting "all the seas, and for the common advantage of all sailing the seas, "to fit out another fleet, and has ordered the most distinguished "Edward Popham to take command of the same"—therefore his

---

[1] This letter does not appear in the Printed Collection or in Phillips; but it is in the Skinner Transcript (No. 113 there), whence it has been printed by Mr. Hamilton in his *Milton Papers* (pp. 10—11). It has no date whatever attached to it in the Transcript, and is quite out of its place there. The matter fixes the date pretty closely, and I have taken the exact date of the last.

Spanish Majesty is requested to allow Popham or any of his ships to come freely into Spanish harbours for refuge, provisions, &c.

(XI.) To THE HAMBURGERS, *May* 31, 1650:—Mr. Bradshaw has arrived at Hamburg, and been well received. This, accordingly, is a letter of thanks, in which the Hamburg Senators are addressed as "*Amplissimi, Magnifici, et Spectabiles Viri, Amici Carissimi";* but at the same time it is represented that the lawless English and Scottish exiles in Hamburg have been extremely insolent since Bradshaw's arrival, and that their punishment and the protection of Bradshaw are very necessary.

(XII.) To PHILIP IV., KING OF SPAIN: *June* 28, 1650:—From the Commons Journals of this day we find that the House, discussing the news of the murder of Ascham and his interpreter John Baptista de Ripa, at Madrid, adopted a recommendation of the Council of State that a letter demanding justice on the murderers should at once be sent to the King of Spain. As the House was not to meet again till July 2, the Speaker was authorized to sign and send off the letter. Accordingly, Milton's Latin letter, written that same day, was so signed and sent off. It expresses the grief and horror of the Parliament, and their confidence that, as the assassins are said to be in custody, his Majesty, "whose own faith "and honour have been stabbed to the heart," will see speedy justice done on them. It requests also that his Majesty will allow Ascham's corpse to be brought home, and will protect the survivors of the mission.—The names of the assassins may be now given. They were—John Williams, Captain of Foot, a Monmouthshire man, aged 20; William Exparch, a Hampshire man, aged 26; Sir Edward Halsall, a Lancashire man, aged 23; William Harnett, trumpeter, a Yorkshire man, aged 19; Valentine Progers, a Brecknockshire man, aged 33; and his brother Henry Progers, one of Hyde's servants.[1]

(XIII.) To PHILIP IV., KING OF SPAIN (undated, but evidently despatched soon after the last)[2]:—It is a still more vehement remonstrance on the murder of Ascham. "How seriously and with "what bitter indignation your Majesty took that villainous murder "of our agent, Anthony Ascham, and what has hitherto been "done for the punishment of his assassins," the dispatch begins, "we have learnt both from your own letters and from your "Ambassador Don Alfonso de Cardenas. Nevertheless, the more "we think of the atrocity of that act, which utterly subverts the "very principle of correspondence and commerce, if the rights of "Ambassadors, most sacred among all nations, shall be violated by "such a crime with impunity, the less can we refrain from again "most pressingly beseeching your Majesty that due vengeance may "with all possible speed be inflicted on those parricides, and that "you will not allow justice to be longer frustrated by any delay or

---

[1] Commons Journals of date given, and Thurloe, I. 150—151.

[2] No. 114 in Skinner Transcript; much out of its proper place there.

"plea of Sanctuary." It is added that, however acceptable are his Majesty's words of civility and assurances of affection, there can be no hope of a good understanding between England and Spain if the murderers of Ascham escape. The Commonwealth will trust to his Majesty, and accepts the continued residence of Don Alfonso de Cardenas in London as a good omen.

(XIV.) To the most Excellent Lord, Anthony John Lewis de la Cerda, Duke of Medina Celi, Governor of Andalusia: *Nov.* 7, 1650:—This, which is signed by Bradshaw in name of the Council, is a letter of cordial thanks to the said Spanish Provincial Governor for his civilities and good offices to Blake and his men when their pursuit of Rupert's fleet, after its escape from Lisbon, brought them into Spanish waters (ante p. 218).

(XV.) To the Portuguese Envoy (Internuntio Portugallico) i. e. to Don Joseph de Guimaraes:[1]—The letter is not dated in the printed collection; but it is in reply to the letters which Guimaraes had sent from Southampton announcing his arrival in England, and the purport shows that it must have been written between Dec. 17, when the reception to be given the Envoy was first discussed in Parliament, and Dec. 19, when it was resolved by so narrow a majority to allow him to come to London (ante pp. 218, 219). As instructed, Milton is politely cool to the Envoy. "Illustrious Sir," he begins, "we have received your letters, dated "at Southampton the 15th of this month; in which you signify that "you are sent by the King of Portugal to the Parliament of the "Commonwealth of England, but with what official title, whether "Ambassador, Agent, or Internuntio, you do not say." On this point the Parliament would like to have information; and it would be glad to know, moreover, whether the Envoy, whatever may be his title, has come with plenary powers from his Portuguese Majesty to make reparation for the damages done to the English Commonwealth by his protection of a Fleet of rebels and scoundrels all last summer. If the Envoy will give some assurance on this subject, and send a copy of his credential letters, a safe-conduct will be sent to him, and there may perhaps be farther Treaty.

(XVI.) To the Spanish Ambassador: i. e. to Don Alfonso de Cardenas:[2]—This also is undated, but dates itself as written early in January 1650–1, after the credentials of Cardenas for a new treaty had been received by Parliament and the negotiations with him had begun (ante p. 221). The negotiations had been formally opened by Parliament itself, but the real work fell, of course, to the Council of State. In this letter Milton conveys the answer the Council had been instructed to give on the first and paramount head of negotiation—the still unavenged murder of Ascham. After the former letters, it is almost needless to repeat arguments on that point, especially as his Excellency himself has so well observed that his Majesty's own authority is concerned. Nevertheless, the Parliament does again urgently press the matter, and cannot conceive that any plea of religious sanctuary should stand in the way.—In fact, as we know (ante p. 220), through the convenient exchange of prison for sanctuary, all the assassins escaped, except the one who was unfortunate enough to be a Protestant.

---

[1] No. 118 (much out of its place) in the Skinner Transcript.

[2] No. 121 (much out of its place) in the Skinner Transcript.

(XVII.) TO THE ILLUSTRIOUS AND MAGNIFICENT SENATE OF THE CITY OF DANTZIG, *Feb.* 6, 1650 :—One of the consequences of Montrose's roving mission for Charles II. among the northern European powers was that the Grand Council of Poland had imposed a heavy customs-tax on English merchants frequenting Polish and Prusso-Polish parts, the proceeds to go as a subsidy for Charles. The City of Dantzig, itself enjoying free institutions, is prayed not to impose that unjust burthen on English merchants within its bounds, and is assured that the Commonwealth will find means to repay to Dantzig traders any kindness of the Senate.

In the second year of the Commonwealth, it is clear, the part of Milton's duty which consisted in writing Foreign Dispatches had somewhat increased in dimensions, though it was not yet overwhelming. Just at the close of the year, when the Spanish Ambassador Cardenas and the Portuguese Envoy Guimaraes were in London together, bidding against each other for alliance with the Commonwealth, his real experience in oral diplomacy may be said to have begun. He must have had interviews with Cardenas, and there was a special Council order, as we have seen, for his presence with the Committee of Council in their Treaty with Guimaraes in the great chamber, off the Council room, at Whitehall. The treaty was but then beginning, and there were to be many meetings in which the Council's Latin Secretary and the Portuguese Emboyado were to hold colloquy as best they could, the Councillors listening. Both Milton's Spanish and his Portuguese were now in request.

While busy all the year in his Secretarial work, Milton had not been without some small domestic trouble, arising from his concern in the tangled affairs of his late father-in-law, Mr. Powell.

We have seen how bravely, in Nov. 1649, the widow, Mrs. Powell, started her suit for the recovery of any yet recoverable shreds of her late husband's property, and how for the moment she was baffled by the fact that her husband's composition for his delinquency, though begun before his death, had never been completed (ante pp. 145, 146). She had not, however, dropped the suit; and at length, on the 12th of June, 1650, she was rewarded by a decree in her favour, given by the Commissioners for Relief upon Articles of War from their Court of the Painted Chamber. In this decree it is stated that, "after long and deliberate debate" on the case, the Commissioners found that the sale of her husband's goods and household stuff at Foresthill, in June 1646, had been a decided violation of his right by the Articles of the surrender of Oxford, and that therefore the Oxfordshire Committee of Sequestrators who had directed the sale were answerable for the whole amount of the loss. The goods and stuff, it is noted, had been sold to Matthew Appletree of London for £335, "although of far greater value," and Appletree had since then removed and resold a portion of them, to the amount of £91 11*s.* 10*d.*—which sum remained in his hands; wherefore the order of the Commissioners is that all the undispersed residue, at Foresthill or anywhere else, be forthwith delivered to Mrs. Powell, the Oxfordshire sequestrators to settle with her, and with Appletree, about the rest. Nothing is said in the decree of the £400 worth of timber, also belonging to Mr. Powell, which had been appropriated by Parliament itself in July 1646; but in equity the principle of the decree pointed to a restitution of that also. If all went smoothly, therefore, Mrs. Powell might look forward to the recovery of about £900 worth of her late husband's effects (about £500 from the Oxfordshire sequestrators, as the full value of the goods and household stuff, and £400 from Parliament for the timber), subject to the deduction of the fine for composition. About that fine itself a question might arise. It had been fixed, in Dec. 1646, at £180; but that had been on a very severe valuation of his estate as returned by himself, making no allowance for his pleaded debts, and including not only the above £900 worth of personal effects, but also his small bit of real estate at Wheatley, estimated by him at £40 a year (Vol. III. 633–

635). As Mrs. Powell at the utmost was to recover only about half the value upon which the fine had been calculated, ought there not to be proportional abatement of the fine in her favour? That minor question hardly came forward in the continued pressure of the major. Not only was there no sign of any compensation from Parliament for its unjust seizure of the timber; but the Oxfordshire sequestrators and the harpy Appletree resisted the decree of the Commissioners on Articles respecting the household goods. As late as Nov. 27 the Commissioners have to repeat their decree in a still more peremptory form. Leaving as it was their former order about the undispersed portion of the goods, they now order Appletree to pay without fail to Mrs. Powell, by the 4th of December, the £91 11*s*. 10*d*. of cash in his hands for goods sold by him, and they also order the Sequestrators to hand over to Mrs. Powell the 20*s*. which Appletree, at the date of the sale at Foresthill, had paid them in earnest of the whole sum of £335 he had agreed to give for his bargain. When the 4th of December came, however, Appletree was still a defaulter; and, as the powers of the Court of the Painted Chamber lapsed on the 20th of that month, Mrs. Powell remained at the year's end without benefit from their decree.

Meanwhile an Act of Parliament, passed Aug. 1, 1650, had complicated her interests as executrix generally under her husband's will, and had brought other persons, Milton included, into unpleasant connexion with her affairs.

We have already noticed (Vol. III. pp. 637–639) a discrepancy between the estimate of the late Mr. Powell's property contained in his own return to the Commissioners for Compositions, given in five weeks before his death, and the estimate of the same contained in his will of Dec. 30, 1646, two days before his death. In the former document, in which it was Mr. Powell's interest to seem as poor as possible, his assets, against debts amounting to more than £2000, are represented as consisting only of about £1800, made up of four distinct items: viz. (1) his bit of real estate at Wheatley in Oxfordshire, valued at £40 a year, (2) about £100 of money owing to him, and (3 and 4) the everlasting £500 worth of household goods and £400 worth of timber. Nothing is said of any remaining interest in his former mansion and estate of Foresthill, and the implication is that that property had passed absolutely to his creditor Sir Robert Pye, who had entered into legal possession of it in May or June 1646. In the will, on the other hand, the Foresthill mansion and estate are expressly bequeathed to his eldest son, Richard Powell, in trust for all the members of the family, and Sir Robert Pye, then their possessor, is appointed, with another "loving friend," to be overseer of the will and to assist in executing its provisions. We interpreted this at the time as implying some private understanding between the Powells and the Pyes, whereby the Pyes, as creditors of Powells, were really to be only *locum tenentes* for the Powells till it should be convenient for the Powells to discharge their obligation and recover Foresthill. Meanwhile, it appears, Sir Robert Pye, the elder, had, by indenture dated Dec. 3, 1648, conveyed the estate to his second son, John Pye, Esq. This John Pye, Esq., was now, therefore, the representative of the Pye family in their relations, whatever they were, to the Powells.

All this and much more was brought to light by the Act of Parliament of Aug. 1, 1650. By that Act, which was in fact framed for the purpose of defeating attempts of delinquent families to escape their full penalties by conveying away portions of their property into friendly hands, it was ordered that "all such persons as have since the 20th "of May, 1642 entered upon the estates of any delinquent by "virtue of any extent, mortgage, &c., for which as yet no "composition hath been made, do pay into the Treasury at "Goldsmiths' Hall such sum and sums of money as the said "delinquent should or ought to have paid for his composi-"tion," allowance to be made for all just debts chargeable on the estate. A fine stir this must have occasioned among hundreds or thousands of people throughout England; but we are concerned only with the Powell connexion. In that connexion the Act brought out at once five persons.—First of all, about the beginning of the same month of August (exact day not ascertained), Milton comes forward. He petitions for leave to compound, according to the Act, for the small Wheatley property of which he had been legally possessed since Nov. 1647, as creditor to his late father-in-law for an original debt of £500, due since 1627, though with a claim upon him for one third of the income of the property as dower for Mrs. Powell.—Then, on the 23rd of the same month, Mrs. Powell comes forward, and makes *her* statement to the Commissioners for Compositions. She informs them that another Honourable Board of Commissioners (those for Relief on Articles of War) have recently given a decree in her favour against the Oxfordshire sequestrators for part of her late husband's personal effects, and then she proceeds to mention the Wheatley property. That property, she says, is worth £40 a year, and is certainly in possession of Mr. Milton by extent for an old debt; but then it is burdened otherwise with a debt of £400 and interest since 1631 to one Mr. Ashworth (Vol. II. p. 496), with her own dower or thirds, and with divers debts besides to the amount of £1200—all which, as well as the injuries done her in the matter of the personal goods, she prays the Commissioners to remember in adjusting the Wheatley fine. *Her* interest, of course, was that there should be either no fine at all on the property, or that it should be small, inasmuch as it would have to be added to the debts to be satisfied out of the revenues of the property, or otherwise discharged, before the property could revert to her and her children. Hence her interference, and her mention of the Ashworth debt and other burdens on the property beyond Milton's tenancy by his "extent."—The very next day John Pye, Esq., comes forward, rehearsing the story of the acquisition in 1646 by his father, Sir Robert Pye, of Mr. Powell's mansion and estate of Foresthill, by due legal process, for a debt of £1510 since 1641, and of the subsequent transfer of the same to himself, and suggesting that, as the estate was virtually forfeited before Mr. Powell's delinquency, as it was entered upon before Mr. Powell's sequestration, and as the whole proprietary interest in it that was once Mr. Powell's is now his, therefore he ought to be allowed to retain his title without any composition whatever, or at least ought to have the full original debt and damages ratified to him. A Particular of the revenue from the Foresthill property, valuing it at £293 0*s.* 8*d.* per annum, with charges upon it to the amount of £60 per annum, accompanied the petition.—Finally, on the 28th of August, there came forward Sir Edward Powell, Knight and Baronet, and Elizabeth Ashworth, administratrix to the late Edward Ashworth. The Baronet's petition is that, having been in possession since 1646 of a lease of some Wheatley property of the late Mr. Powell (not that which Milton held), on account of a debt of £300 due since 1641 (Vol. II. p. 497), he should be admitted to compound for it according to the Act. Mrs. Ashworth's petition is less intelligible, as it refers to the Wheatley property of which Milton was in possession, and for which *he* had asked leave to compound. Her husband, however, she alleges, had lent Mr. Powell £400 on the security of a ninety-nine years' lease of that property, and, to preserve her rights, she desires to be admitted to a composition. Her rights seem to have been those of entry on the property after Milton should vacate it.

So much in August 1650, the month in which the Act was passed. In the course of the next few months the Commissioners, investigating many cases of the kind, must have had in review the applications from the various substitutes for the late Mr. Powell. On one they seem to have looked with great suspicion. Why should Mr. Pye, in possession of Foresthill for a debt dating from 1641, ask more favour than Sir Edward Powell, in possession of a Wheatley lease for a debt dating from the same year, or than Mr. Milton, in possession of other Wheatley property for a debt dating actually from 1627? Why should he suggest that the Foresthill property ought not to be treated as a Delinquent's estate at all, but as an estate wholly forfeited to the Parliamentarian Sir Robert Pye by Mr. Powell before his delinquency? The Commissioners may or may not have had before them Mr. Powell's will of Dec. 30, 1646, in which, so far from regarding the Foresthill mansion and lands, then in Sir Robert Pye's possession, as wholly lost and alienated, he had actually bequeathed them to his family as the chief provision for its various members after his debts should be paid, naming Sir Robert Pye as a friend who would assist in the business. Anyhow Mr. Pye's peculiar petition led to more minute inquiries on the part of the Commissioners as to his tenure of Foresthill, inducing him to bring forward, in December 1650, three witnesses in his interest. One was his father, Sir Robert Pye, who swore to the reality of the original debt and of the conveyance of Foresthill to him on account of it. Another was a Richard Sherwyn of Westminster, who had witnessed the sealing and signing of the deed of conveyance. The third was Mrs. Powell, who swore to the fact that Laurence Farre, servant to Sir Robert Pye, had taken possession of the Foresthill premises for his master in May or the beginning of June 1646, *before* any sequestration had been laid upon them or any other part of her husband's estate.

On the whole, one sees a most resolute determination on the part of Mrs. Powell not to let go any claim she had in any portion of her late husband's property, and to intermeddle in all transactions appertaining to its scattered fragments. Hence her interference about the composition for the Wheatley cottages, tithes, and bits of land, in Milton's possession, a high fine on which, though paid by Milton, would fall on the future of the property itself. One suspects, however, something more in the other cases. May there not have been some friendly, though not perhaps positively illegal, collusion between Mrs. Powell and the Pyes, if not also between her and Sir Edward Powell, and between her and Mrs. Ashworth? Though they were all, doubtless, creditors of her late husband, and originally for the sums stated, and at the times stated, may they not, for some consideration or other, have regarded themselves as but temporary trustees for Mrs. Powell and her children, and may not Pye and Sir Edward have even been allowing her something meanwhile out of the rents?

The result does not belong to our present political year.

Meanwhile, to confirm our conjectures generally, we may overstep, as far as Milton is concerned, the strict bounds of the year by a very few days. He had petitioned for leave to compound for his Wheatley property immediately after the passing of the Act in August. Busy with other things, however, he had neglected the necessary details. Hence, official under Government though he was, the Inland Revenue authorities had done their duty, and stopped his Wheatley rents. This he must have learnt just at the close of the year, when he was engaged with the Spanish Ambassador and the Portuguese Envoy, and when the Parliament were electing the new Council of State. Then he put matters right, as follows:—

"To the Honourable the Commissioners for Sequestration at Haberdashers' Hall the Petition of JOHN MILTON showeth:—

"That he, being to compound by the late Act for certain land at Wheatley in Oxfordshire, belonging to Mr. Richard Powell, late of Foresthill in the same county, by reason of an extent which he hath upon the said lands by a statute, did put in his Petition about the middle of August last, which was referred accordingly; but, having had important business ever since by order of the Council of State, he hath had no time to proceed in the perfecting of his composition, and in the meantime finds that order hath been given out from hence to forbid his tenants to pay him rent. He therefore now desires he may have all convenient despatch, and that the order of sequestering may be recalled, and that the composition may be moderated as much as may be, in regard that Mrs. Powell, the widow of the said Mr. Richard Powell, hath her cause depending before the Commissioners in the Painted Chamber for Breach of Articles, who have adjudged her satisfaction to be made for the great damage done her by seizing and selling the personal estate divers days after the Articles were sealed. But, by reason of the expiring of that Court, she hath received as yet no satisfaction; and besides she hath her thirds out of that land—which was not considered when her husband followed his composition; and, lastly, the taxes, free quartering, and finding of arms, were not then considered—which have been since very great, and are likely to be greater.

"And your Petitioner shall be ready to pay what may be thought reasonable at any day that shall be appointed.

"25 Feb. 1650–1. JOHN MILTON."

Marginal Note in Milton's own hand to this Petition. "I do "swear that this debt, for which I am to compound according to "my Petition, is a true and real debt, as will appear upon record.

"*Jur.* 25 Feb. 1650–1. JOHN MILTON."

This document, partly in the hand of Milton's lawyer, partly in his own, coming before the Commissioners in Haberdashers' Hall on the day in which it is dated, receives immediate attention. "Mr. Brereton is desired by the Com-"missioners to perfect his report on Mr. Milton's case by "Tuesday next," is the decision on the document itself, initialed by two of the Commissioners, *A. S.* and *E. W.* Mr. Peter Brereton was auditor for the Commission; and the "Tuesday next," appointed for his report, was that day week, or March 4. In the interim Milton furnished the additional information necessary. On the 28th of February he put on record before the Commissioners, as he had promised in the marginal note to his petition, the exact circumstances of the original debt of £500 due to him by Mr. Powell since 1627, and swore in the record that he had received at several times about £180 towards the discharge of that debt, leaving about £300 still owing. In a separate paper he gave "A Particular" of the estate for which he was to compound. It consisted, he said, of "the tithe corn of Wheatley and certain cottages of the clear yearly value of £60" with "three yards and a half of land, arable and pasture, of the clear yearly value of £20." The total for which he was to compound, therefore, was worth £80 a year; "out of which he craveth "to be allowed for the thirds which he payeth to Mrs. Anne "Powell, the relict of the said Richard Powell, for her dower," i. e. £26 13*s.* 4*d.* per annum, and also that his just debt of £300 may be taken into account in the composition. Mr. Brereton's report on the 4th of March simply recapitulates these facts of the case in a clear form for the judgment of the Commissioners. At the same time he reported separately the facts of Mrs. Powell's case and the nature of her Petition. The Commissioners, with the two reports before them, then and there settled the matter. They fixed the composition fine for the Wheatley property at £130, the first moiety to be paid by Milton into the Treasury at Goldsmiths' Hall within fourteen days, when the sequestration would be suspended, and the second moiety to be paid by him within six weeks after, when the sequestration would be completely discharged, and Milton, his executors, administrators, and assigns, should have the free and full enjoyment of the property, till he should be repaid his just debt and the £130 of fine as well. The fine seems rather high. The rigid two years' value would have been £160, and of this the Commissioners allowed off only £30, evidently disallowing the claim of abatement on account of Mrs. Powell's thirds.

Several things are worth noting in the course of this transaction. It is clear, in the first place, that Milton, who had never received anything of the £1000 promised him as a marriage portion with his wife, but on the contrary stood creditor for £300 to his father-in-law, had thought himself entitled, or even bound, in the interest of his wife and children, to use his legal right of stepping into possession of the Wheatley property and holding it for the satisfaction of his debt. It is farther clear, however, that he was not inconsiderate of the interests of Mrs. Powell and her other children. Not only had he been paying her £26 13*s.* 4*d.* a year, as her thirds from the Wheatley revenue—which it now appeared, by the decision of the Commissioners, he had not been bound to do; he had also, it would seem, been willing to co-operate with her as far as he could in the composition arrangement. In one point, however, there could be no co-operation. Mr. Powell, in his composition statement of Nov. 21, 1646, five weeks before his death, had valued the Wheatley property, "before these times," i. e. at its best before the troubles, as worth £40 a year, all the three items of the "tithes," the "three yard lands and a half," and the "cottages," included; Mrs. Powell, in her Petition of Aug. 23, 1650, interfering with Milton's Petition to compound for the property, had adhered to the same valuation of £40 year; but Milton, when he comes actually to compound, gives the value at £80 a year, or exactly double. This is very significant. Very willing, for his own sake, and for Mrs. Powell's, that the composition fine should be as moderate as possible, he could consent to no false dealing in his own behalf or in hers. The property he had ascertained, after three years of possession, was distinctly worth £80 a year, and that must be the return to the Haberdashers' Hall Commissioners.[1]

Through the year 1650, amid the routine duties of the Secretaryship, and the private worries of the Composition business for the Wheatley property in connexion with Mrs. Powell's claims, Milton had not been without occupation of the literary kind. To this year, in fact, belong two of his feats of prose authorship.

The first and slightest was the publication of a new edition of his *Eikonoklastes.* The first edition, published in October 1649, had been the only reply to the King's Book of any considerable effect; and, as the King's Book was still in everybody's hands, a second edition of the Reply was desirable. The order for such a second edition, I suppose, must have been given by the Council of State, at whose instance the first had been prepared; but I have found no distinct record on the subject. Here, at all events, is the title of the new edition:—"Εἰκονοκλάστης *in Answer to &c* [rest of title same as given for first edition, ante pp. 132, 133, as far as to the end of the quotations from Sallust, save that the third of those quotations is corrected thus: "*Impunè quælibet facere, id est Regem esse.—Idem Bell. Jugurth.;*" after which, however, the imprint is changed as follows:—] *Publish'd now the Second time, and much Enlarg'd. London, Printed by T. N., and are to be sold by Tho. Brewster and G. Moule at the three Bibles in Pauls Church-yard near the West-End,* 1650." Matthew Simmons, it will be noted, is not the printer of this edition.[2]

---

[1] The documents on which I have based the account, given in the last few pages, of the Milton-Powell business transactions of 1650, and as far as to March 4, 1650—1, will be found in most complete form in Hamilton's *Milton Papers,* pp. 47—57, and Appendix, pp. 76—98. They are very numerous and intricate; and a shrewd lawyer might have been, in some points, a better interpreter of them than myself. As some knowledge of the time, however, as well as of law-technicalities, is required for their interpretation, and as they have lain hitherto in print without any interpretation whatever, a mere mass of jargon, with repetitions, inventories, and what not, I have done my best, by careful and repeated study, to extract their real story; and I do not think I have erred in anything essential. On several points I have obtained indirect light from the Commons Journals.

[2] A copy in the Grenville Library in the British Museum, from which I have taken the title, as above, has "G. Dury, 1650" and "Ex dono authoris" written on the title-page, in a hand which is *not* Milton's. In Bohn's Lowndes (Art. MILTON) it is stated that there is extant a copy with this inscription in Milton's autograph: "To be presented to the

The book, like the first edition, is a small quarto; and, as it consists but of 230 pages, while the first consisted of 242, the "enlargements" were managed by somewhat closer printing. Most of them are mere brief interpolated sentences of little consequence; and only two claim notice here.[1]

The original Preface is extended at the end by what would make about a page and a half of the present volume. In the added matter the following are the most vital sentences: i. e. the sentences suggested by the appearances of things since 1649. He is saying that the King's Book, so far from recanting any of those doctrines of Government that had been the causes of the strife between him and the people, actually reavowed them in their worst forms: e. g.

[The King in his Book] "dishonours and attaints all Protestant Churches not prelatical, and what they piously reformed, with the slander of rebellion, sacrilege, and hypocrisy; [and yet] they who seemed of late to stand up hottest for the Covenant can now sit mute, and much pleased to hear all these opprobrious things uttered against their faith, their freedom, and themselves in their own doings made traitors to boot. The Divines also, their wizards, can be so brazen as to cry Hosanna to this Book, which cries louder against them for no disciples of Christ, but of Iscariot, and to seem now convinced with these withered arguments and reasons, here the same which in some other writings of that party, and in his own former declarations and expresses, they have so often heretofore endeavoured to confute and to explode; none appearing all this while to vindicate Church or State from these calumnies and reproaches but a small handful of men, whom they defame and spit at with all the odious names of Schism and Sectarism. I never knew that time in England when men of truest religion were not counted Sectaries; but wisdom now, valour, justice, constancy,

---

Right Hon. the Earle of Carbery." This is Richard Vaughan, second Earl of Carbery in the Irish peerage, who was now, or became, the husband of the Lady Alice Egerton, the heroine of *Comus.*

[1] In nearly all the editions of Milton's Prose Works to this day, the reprint of the *Eikonoklastes* is merely from the first or 1649 edition. In 1756 Richard Baron published a reprint of the second or 1650 edition, and took much credit for having discovered a copy of that edition, and so enabled himself to supersede the previous reprints, which had all been from the first. In Bohn's edition of the Prose Works, and perhaps in others, Baron's enlarged text is properly given, and his Preface quoted. In a copy of the second edition in the British Museum (press-mark $\frac{599.\ e.\ 18}{1.2}$) some one has bracketed in pencil the added passages.

prudence, united and embodied to defend religion and our liberties, both by word and deed, against tyranny, is counted Schism and Faction."

The most interesting enlargement, however, is in the part of the first chapter containing the exposure of the theft of one of the King's Prayers from Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia* (ante pp. 136–140). This had been the strongest popular hit in the *Eikonoklastes*, and there had been a great deal of remark upon it, with something like consternation among the Royalists. As the fact could not be denied, various hypotheses had been started in explanation. The Pamela Prayer had not appeared in all the copies of the King's Book, but only in some: might it not have been, therefore, a blunder of the printers or publishers in some of the early editions after the first and most genuine one? The book being in such demand, and copies going about in all sorts of forms, might not the printers, having received from somebody or other the Appendix of Prayers purporting to have been delivered by the King to Dr. Juxon "immediately before his death," have stuffed it into some editions, to give them a special interest, without having made due inquiry? Nay, who knew but that the printers had been tampered with, and that the insertion of the stolen prayer into some editions of the *Eikon* had been an infamous trick of the Regicides or their agents to bring discredit on the noble book? Perhaps Mr. Milton himself, who had announced his discovery with such a flourish of trumpets, could tell, better than most people, how the prayer had come to be where he so easily found it! All this gossip and a great deal more, some of it in the Royalist news-sheets, having reached Milton, and this particular passage in the first edition having proved, as we have said, the most popular in the whole book, Milton enlarges the passage in the second edition to about four times its former extent. The first addition is as follows:—

"They who are yet incredulous of what I tell them for a truth, that this Philippic prayer is no part of the King's goods, may satisfy their own eyes at leisure in the third Book of Sir Philip's

Arcadia, p. 248, comparing Pamela's prayer with the first prayer of his Majesty delivered to Dr. Juxon immediately before his death and entitled 'A Prayer in Time of Captivity,' printed in all the best editions of his Book. And, since there be a crew of lurking railers, who in their libels and their fits of railing up and down, as I hear from others, take it so currishly that I should dare to tell abroad the secrets of their Egyptian Apis, to gratify their gall in some measure yet more. . . . I shall gorge them once more with this digression somewhat larger than before."

Then, making more of the whole thing than it was worth, he goes on to enlarge his former comments on the fact of the plagiarism, still representing it as a hideous impiety and imposture. "He certainly whose mind could "serve him to seek a Christian prayer out of a Pagan legend "and assume it for his own, might gather up the rest God "knows whence: one perhaps out of the French *Astræa*, "another out of the Spanish *Diana; Amadis* and *Palmerin* "could hardly escape him." Again, "How unhappy, how for-"sook of grace, and unbelieved of God, that people who "resolve to know no more of piety or of goodness than to "account him their chief saint and martyr whose bankrupt "devotion came not honestly by his very prayers, but, having "sharked them from the mouth of a heathen worshipper "(detestable to teach him prayers), sold them to those that "stood and honoured him next to Messiah, as his own "heavenly compositions in adversity, for hopes no less vain "and presumptuous (and death at that time so imminent "upon him) than by these goodly reliques to be held a saint "and martyr in opinion with the cheated people!" It seems impossible that Milton could have written this if he was not still under the impression that Charles was, or might have been, the author of the *Eikon*. He takes no direct notice, it will be observed, of the wild charge that he himself, or some one else about the Council of State, had diabolically managed the insertion of the Pamela prayer into editions of the *Eikon* by tampering with the printers.[1]

---

[1] I am not quite sure that the charge of having been himself the fabricator of the imposition was deliberately made against Milton by the Royalists as early as 1650; though I think it very likely. But in that strange stream of Restora-

The second edition of the *Eikonoklastes* in 1650, however, was a mere trifle compared with the preparation in the same year of Milton’s Defence of the Commonwealth in answer to Salmasius. This had been Milton’s real labour of the year 1650. The task had been set to him by the Council of State on the 8th of January, and through all the intervening months, in the intervals of his office-work, he had been pursuing it in his house at the Scotland Yard end of Whitehall, reading Salmasius’s book again and again, making inquiries about him, glancing at his other books, marking passages

---

tion tradition, which seems to have choked all high honour out of the English literary conscience for some generations, the charge has actually come down to our day, and apparently with no more serious reflection in connection with it in some quarters than that the fabrication would have been a clever *ruse de guerre.* Even Dr. Johnson, in his Life of Milton, could write, “As “faction seldom leaves a man honest, “however it might find him, Milton is “suspected of having interpolated the “book called *Eikon Basilike,* which the “Council of State, to whom he was now “made Latin Secretary, employed him “to censure, by inserting a prayer taken “from Sidney’s *Arcadia,* and imputing “it to the King, whom he charges, in “his *Eikonoklastes,* with the use of this “prayer, as with a heavy crime, in the “indecent language with which prosperity had emboldened the advocates “for rebellion to insult all that is venerable or great.” He adds that the interpolation was probably at least managed by the Regicides among them, and that, as “the use of the adaptation” by the King, had it been his, would have been “innocent,” so “they who could “so noisily censure it, with a little extension of their malice, could contrive “what they wanted to accuse.” This is pretty strong, though cautiously expressed ; but what is to be thought of the repetition in 1812, without query or comment, in such a work as Nichols’s *Literary Anecdotes* (Vol. I. pp. 525—6) of the direct charge against Milton in this form ?—“These [the editions of the “*Eikon Basilike* through 1649] were “first printed by Dugard, who was “Milton’s intimate friend, and happened to be taken printing an edition “of the King’s book. Milton used his “interest to bring him off; which he “effected by the means of Bradshaw, “but upon this condition, that Dugard “should add Pamela’s prayer to the “aforesaid book he was printing, as an “atonement for his fault, they designing “thereby to bring a scandal upon the “book and blast the reputation of its “authority. To the same purpose, Dr. “Bernard, who, as well as Gill [one of “the sources of the preceding legend], “was physician to Hills, Oliver’s printer, “and told him this story : ‘That he had “‘often heard Bradshaw and Milton “‘laugh at their inserting this prayer “‘out of Sir Philip Sidney’s Arcadia.’” In another form of the legend it is Dugard’s wife who consents, while her husband is in Newgate, to foist in the prayer.—It is hardly worth while to point out that the first edition of Milton’s *Eikonoklastes,* exposing the Pamela plagiarism, appeared in October 1649, and that Dugard was committed to Newgate four months afterwards, in Feb. 1649—50 (ante p. 152), and was not released, by Milton’s or Bradshaw’s intercession, till April 1650. But, if any Anti-Eikonoklast still wants to work out some profound solution of the Pamela Prayer mystery, on the assumption that the *Eikon* was really the King’s and that the Regicides diabolically contrived the interpolation, have we not furnished means that may be converted to mischief (though *how* we cannot quite conjecture) in that unexplained and cancelled entry in the Stationers’ Registers, under date March 16, 1648—9, of an edition of the *Eikon* as forthcoming from the shop of Matthew Simmons, one of the Commonwealth’s printers, and who was the first printer of the *Eikonoklastes* (ante p. 148) ? Could not a story be spun out of *that ?* If only it could be ascertained that Simmons’s edition of the *Eikon* did appear, and that it was the first that contained the Pamela Prayer ? What then ?

and jotting down notes and observations, till at length the reply took shape, and the Latin paragraphs that were to confound Salmasius began to roll upon the paper. Night and day, but chiefly in early morning hours, by sunlight or by candlelight, the work had been going on. But O! at what a cost it was to be! His left eye already useless, so that hardly longer was there even the vague iridescent halo that there used to be round luminous objects on that side, but all was darkish or opaque, there were warnings that the other eye likewise might fail before long. Reasoning with him on this and on the general state of his health, his physicians (and Milton, as Phillips tells us, was much given to "tampering with physic" and consulting physicians) had distinctly told him the probable consequences if he persisted in his task. But he had taken his resolution. Not the voice of Æsculapius himself from his Epidaurian temple, he says, would have prevailed. Knowing the fatal alternative before him to be blindness or desertion of duty, he had deliberately chosen blindness. And so, the evil done, though not yet absolutely manifest,—if indeed it would not have come all the same, though perhaps more slowly, had he chosen the other alternative,—his task had been finished. On the 23rd of December, as we have seen, it was ordered by the Council of State "that "Mr. Milton do print the Treatise which he hath written in "answer to a late book written by Salmasius against the pro"ceedings of this Commonwealth"; and on the 31st of the same month "*Johannis Miltoni, Angli, pro Populo Anglicano Defensio contra Claudii Salmasii Defensionem Regiam:* both in Latin and English," was the entry of the forthcoming book in the Stationers' Registers.[1]

The printer who registered the book as his copyright, and who did so "by order of the Council of State," was William Dugard. He was the "Mr. Dugard" whom we saw committed prisoner to Newgate, deprived of his printing presses, and dismissed from his Mastership in Merchant Taylors' School, by order of the Council of State, Feb. 1, 1649–50, because he had been concerned in printing the *Eikon Basilike* and other things against the Commonwealth, and was then printing or attempting to print an English edition of the book of Salmasius. What a change! Newgate had tamed him, as it had tamed Needham, and he too had succumbed. The story, as it was told long afterwards, in Restoration times, by a person who had been Dugard's corrector of the press before his arrest, is that Dugard's wife had applied to Bradshaw for his release, that Bradshaw had said he would send a friend of his to talk with him and see what could be done, that Milton accordingly went to Newgate and proposed terms to Dugard, that these were at first stoutly refused, but that afterwards the clever wife, Bradshaw, and Milton, "juggled together," till poor Dugard had to yield.[1] Legendary in particulars, the story is quite credible as to the main fact. The reconciliation to the Commonwealth of a scholarly man like Dugard must have seemed to Milton worth an effort. He had succeeded. Dugard, after a short imprisonment, had been released; and now, with his press restored to him, and readmitted also to his Mastership in Merchant Taylors' School, he was to be the respectable chief printer for the Commonwealth, employed on all printing work above the mark of Matthew Simmons. Instead of Salmasius's own book, he was printing Milton's answer to Salmasius. The proofs must have been passing between his printing office and Milton's residence in Scotland Yard at the very time when Milton was attending at the first interviews of the Committee of Council with the Portuguese Envoy and settling his private composition-business with the Commissioners at Haberdashers' Hall. Let us suppose that we have access to the proofs and can have a private perusal of the book a week or two before its actual appearance.

---

[1] Council Order Books of dates given; Milton's *Def. Sec.* (1654); and my notes from the Stationers' Registers.

PRO POPULO ANGLICANO DEFENSIO CONTRA SALMASIUM.

As the book of Salmasius had consisted of a Preface and twelve Chapters, so Milton's, though it is but about half the length of Salmasius's, keeps to the same plan. In the Preface, where he reviews Salmasius's Preface, and makes quotations from it, the battle is already begun:—

---

[1] Stationers' Registers; Wordsworth's *Who wrote Eikon Basilike?* 139—140.

"Although I fear lest, if in defending the People of England I am as profuse in words and empty of matter as most men think Salmasius has been in his Defence of the King, I should seem to merit the character of a most verbose and at the same time a most silly defender, yet, since no man, even in the treatment of any ordinary subject, thinks himself obliged to make such haste but that he will prefix some customary introduction, corresponding to the dignity of the work he has undertaken, so I, in handling almost the greatest subject that ever was, may be permitted to do the same, and not to cramp myself too much, if only because I am in hopes of well-nigh attaining by this means two things which I should earnestly desire—first, the consciousness of not having been at all wanting, as far as in me lies, to this most noble cause, and most worthy of the memory of all future ages; next a verdict from my readers that I have nevertheless avoided myself the frivolousness and redundancy which I blame in my adversary. For I am to speak of matters neither small nor common, but how a most potent King, who had trampled on the Laws, given a shock to Religion, and was reigning at his own pleasure, was at last vanquished in the field by the people that had served a long servitude to him, was then cast into prison, and finally, when he gave no ground at all, either by words or by actions, for hoping better things of him, was condemned to death by the Supreme Council of the Kingdom and beheaded by the axe before his own palace-gates. I am to relate also (which will much conduce to the relief of men's minds from a great superstition) by what right, especially according to *our* Law, this was adjudged and done, and shall easily defend my valiant and upright countrymen, who have deserved most conspicuously well of all the united citizenship and nationalities of the world, from the most wicked calumnies of their revilers, whether domestic or foreign, and in the first place from the revilings of this most inane Sophist, who sets up as the leader and coryphæus of the rest . . . Which enterprise though the chief men in our Commonwealth prevailed upon me by their authority to undertake, and would have it to be distinctly *my* business to defend with my pen, against envy and detraction, which defy mere weapons of steel and the apparatus of war, those acts of theirs which, under God's guidance, they had with great glory performed (and certainly such work of defence comes next to the doing of the actions),—whose opinion of me I indeed consider a great honour, that by their votes *I* should be pitched upon, before others, as the man competent for this far from despicable service to the valiant liberators of my country, howsoever from my earliest youth I had been myself enthusiastic in those studies which gave the passion, if not for actually doing deeds of supreme excellence, at least for praising them,—yet, distrusting these aids, I have recourse now to the divine help, and invoke the great and good God, the giver of all gifts, that as prosperously and piously as these illustrious champions of our liberty broke the King's pride and his unruly domination in battle, and then put an end to them at last by a memorable punishment, and with as little trouble as lately one man out of many refuted and overcame the King himself, rising as it were from the grave, and in that book published after his death insinuating himself with the people by new subtleties and allurements, with equal success and equal truth I may discuss and expose the petulance and lies of this foreign declaimer. . . . If any one should chance to wonder why then we have suffered him to flutter about so long untouched and triumphant, puffed up with the silence of us all, about others I know nothing, but about myself I can boldly say that I had no need of long search for words or arguments with which to defend so good a cause, if I had been in possession of leisure or of health sufficient for the labour of writing. Even now what health I have is so poor and precarious that I am forced to take up piecemeal, and with a break almost every hour, this piece of composition, which otherwise it would have been my duty to prosecute continuously and with unintermitted attention. . . .

Come then; enough of preface; and, since we have to do with critics, let us see, in the first place, what says the title of this fine volume. 'DEFENSIO REGIA PRO CAROLO I. AD CAROLUM II.!' A mighty task, whoever you are! you defend the father before the son: a wonder if you don't win the cause! But I summon you, Salmasius, elsewhere skulking under another name, and now under none, before another bench and other judges, where perchance you will not hear those cries of *Bravo! Well-said!* which you are in the habit of miserably trying for in your literary lecture-room. But why to the King's son this King's defence? No need of torture: we have the man's own confession! '*Sumptibus Regiis*: at the King's Expense,' he says on the title-page. O you venal and fee-taking agent! would you not undertake the defence of Charles the father, a most excellent King in your opinion, to Charles the son, a very poor King, unless at the royal expense? But, old rogue that you are, you knew what you were about in calling it the King's defence; for what you had sold was no longer yours, but lawfully already the King's—bought, in fact, with a hundred Jacobuses, a huge price for a very needy King to pay. We are not speaking at random: we know who brought those gold pieces to your house, who brought that purse wrought with the glass spangles; we know who saw you stretching out greedy hands, on pretence of embracing the King's Chaplain sent with the gift, but really to clutch the gift itself, and so, by accepting that one sum of money, almost exhaust the King's treasury.[1] . . .

Whatever the piece is to be, the orator comes on the stage buskined beyond the ordinary: '*Horribilis nuper nuntius aures nostras atroci vulnere, sed magis mentes, perculit, de parricidio apud Anglos in personâ Regis sacrilegorum hominum nefariâ conspiratione admisso!*' Truly that horrible news must have had a sword much longer than that which Peter drew, or else those ears must have been very long ears indeed which it smote with so far-off a wound; for it could not in the least offend any ears that were not stupid. For what harm is done to *you*, which of *you* is hurt, if we punish with death our enemies and opponents, whether Commoners, Nobles, or Kings? Put aside, Salmasius, things that do not concern you; for I have also horrible news to bring about yourself, which will, if I am not mistaken, smite with a more dreadful wound the ears of all Grammarians and Critics, if they have any delicacy and learning: news, to wit, of a parricide committed among the Hollanders on the person of Aristarchus [a most famous Grammarian of antiquity, and therefore made here to personify Latinity or Grammatical Correctness], by the wicked audacity of Salmasius, inasmuch as you, the great critic, hired at the King's expense to write a *Defensio Regia*, have not only started with an affected exordium, likest to the canting nonsense of the paid mourners at funerals, which could move the pity of no one not an idiot, but have nearly raised immediate laughter in the readers by a clot of barbarisms in the very first sentence. For what, I pray, is it *parricidium in personâ Regis admittere*, or what is *in personâ regis?* What Latinity ever so expressed itself? . . . What schoolboy, what insignificant little brother in any monastery, but would have pleaded the King's cause more eloquently, ay, and in better Latin, than this Royal Orator? . . .

---

[1] The chaplain was Dr. George Morley, afterwards Bishop of Worcester, and next of Winchester (Vol. I. p. 498). He had gone abroad after the execution of Charles I., at the age of 51, and attached himself to Charles II. and his Court in Holland. There, says Anthony Wood (Ath. IV. 152), among "his "learned acquaintance" were Andrew "Rivet, Dan. Heinsius, and Claud. Salmasius, whom he often visited; to the "last of which, then abiding in Leyden, "the King sent our author Morley to "give him thanks in his name for the "Apology he had published for his "martyred father, *but not with a purse* "*of gold, as John Milton, the impudent* "*liar, reported.*"

That all may plainly understand that he makes no conscience of what he writes, true or false, right or wrong, no other witness need be produced by me than Salmasius himself. In his *Apparatus contra Primatum Papæ*, he writes that 'there are very powerful reasons 'why the Church ought to return from Episcopacy to the Apostolical 'institution of Presbyters, and that far worse evils were introduced 'into the Church by Episcopacy than those schisms which were 'formerly feared; that the plague which came into the Churches 'from it ruined the whole fabric of the Church with a miserable 'tyranny, bringing even Kings and Princes under the yoke; and 'that greater good would redound to the Church from the extinction of the whole Hierarchy than from the extinction of its head 'the Pope only . . .' [More quotations from Salmasius to the same effect] . . . This and much more he wrote four years ago; and yet now his folly and impudence are such that he dares to attack the Parliament of England, because 'they voted that Episcopacy should not only be ejected from the Senate, but also wholly 'thrown off.' Nay, he actually now recommends and defends Episcopacy, using the identical arguments and reasons in its behalf which in that former book of his he had with great vehemence confuted: e.g. 'that Bishops were necessary, and their retention 'altogether desirable, to prevent the sprouting of a thousand 'pestiferous sects and heresies in England.' O the sneak and turncoat! . . .

You fret that '*mere Hobgoblins, Sons of the Soil, scarcely Nobles at home, scarcely known to their own countrymen, should have thought themselves entitled to do such things.*' You should have remembered what not only the Sacred Books teach on that subject, but even the lyric poet:—

'Valet ima summis
Mutare, et insignem attenuat Deus,
Obscura promens.'

But know also that, of those you say are scarce nobles, some are not inferior to any of your side even in the particular of noble birth, and others, self-made by their activity and virtue, have taken the way to true nobility, and may be compared with the noblest, but would rather be called *Sons of the Soil*, that soil being their own, and act strenuously at home, than beggar out existence in a foreign country, without house or land, at the beck and on the wages of paymasters, selling smoke as you do, you man of nothing and knight of straw! . . . You blame our magistrates for '*admitting a kennel of all sects.*' Why should they not? It is the business of the Church to eject such from the communion of the faithful, not of the Magistrate to expel them from the privileges of citizenship, provided they offend not against the Civil Laws. . . . INDEPENDENTS, such as they are fictitiously painted by you alone, never were seen among us; but only those who, inasmuch as they do not acknowledge Classes and Synods to be above each individual church, are of opinion, as you are or were, that all such are to be rooted out, as so many offshoots of the Hierarchy, if not the real trunk itself. . . . Through the sequel I see that your aim is to stir up all kings and monarchs, not merely to ill-will towards us, but even to a sanguinary war. King Mithridates of old, though on an unlike occasion, tried to stir up all kings against the Romans by nearly the same calumnies: that it was the design of the Romans to subvert all kingdoms, that they respected no human or divine rights, that from the first they had been robbers, and enemies especially to kingly government, possessing nothing but what they had acquired by armed force. So said Mithridates to King Arsaces; but what a self-confidence it is that has brought *you* forward, rhetoricating so childishly in that desk of yours, with the notion that, by exhorting to war and '*blowing the trumpet*,' as you say, though you profess to do it unwillingly, you could possibly move even a king among boys in a playground, particularly with such a slight and ill-favoured mouth that positively I do not believe even Homer's mice, with you for their trumpeter, would ever have made war on the frogs. That is the extent of my fear as to any war or danger that you can possibly rouse up for us, you slug, among foreign kings, with your hasty and insipid eloquence, for all your playful report to them that we '*use Kings' heads for balls, play with crowns as with spinning-tops, make no more of imperial sceptres than if they were clowns' staves with knobs to them.*' You, meanwhile, you silliest of blockheads, are worthy of the fool's staff itself for thinking to persuade kings and princes to war with such puerile arguments. . . .

In your peroration you are perfectly tragic, quite an Ajax with his leather whip: '*The injustice, the impiety, the perfidy, the cruelty, of these men I will proclaim to Heaven and Earth, and will send on the culprits convicted and proved guilty to posterity.*' My daisies! Do *you* then, without wit, without genius, a mouther and a pettifogger, born only to rifle or transcribe good authors, imagine that you can produce anything of your own that will live,—you, whose foolish writings, bundled up with yourself, the next age, believe me, will consign to oblivion? Unless perchance this *Defensio Regia* of yours shall owe something to the Answer to it, and shall therefore, though already for some time neglected and laid to sleep, be again taken up."[1]

In the twelve chapters following this Preface, Milton adheres to Salmasius with exemplary closeness, though his reply, chapter for chapter, is always more brief than his opponent's text. He grapples manfully with Salmasius's doctrine of Royal Absolutism, pursuing him, in his track of argument in the first part of his book, through the Old Testament, the New Testament, the Rabbins, the Greek and Latin classics, the early Christian writers, and Mediæval Theologians and Historians. He redargues here the quotations of Salmasius, and mauls them with counter-quotations from Scripture, Homer, Æschylus, Josephus, Philo Judæus, Aristotle, Catullus, Cicero, Polybius, Sallust, Virgil, Horace, Suetonius, Tacitus, Martial, Tertullian, Sulpicius Severus,

---

[1] Milton's *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio contra Salmasium* was never translated into English in his own lifetime, though it seems to have been intended, when it was first ready, that it should appear simultaneously in Latin and in English (see the registration of the work in the Stationers' Books, ante p. 251). The first English translation of it was by a "Mr. Washington, of the Temple," and was published in 1692. This is the translation sometimes reprinted in editions of Milton's Prose Works. It is faithful and good in the main, and I have had it before me, and have taken phrases from it, while translating the present and subsequent passages from the original; but I have tried to bring the language throughout closer to the meaning, spirit, and Miltonic rhythm, of that original. The syntax is often extremely involved.

St. Augustine, St. Chrysostom, Sozomen, Xiphilinus, Capitolinus, Sichardus, Hottoman, Guiccard, and many more. Then, in the later chapters, taking up the subjects of the history of Kingship and of Parliaments in England, and of English Puritanism and Independency in connexion with the reign of Charles I., he has Salmasius still more and more at his mercy. From the obsoleteness of the matter, and of the style of reasoning, especially in the earlier chapters, a great deal of the book is now unreadable, Milton's though it is; but every now and then there is a spark of Milton's general philosophy, or some interesting and characteristic opinion of his on recent affairs. A few of these minuter *memorabilia* of the book may be here strung together :—

Forms of Government : Republicanism :—" I should wish all to note this again and again, on the authority of God himself in this text (Deut. xvii. 14), that all peoples and nations have always had the free choice of either continuing the form of Government that pleased them, or changing it into another. Of the Hebrews God says this expressly; of other nations He does not deny it : but farther it is implied that the Republican Form was thought by God more perfect than Monarchy, as human things are, and of more use to his own people." *Chapter II.*

Christianity and Absolutism :—" Among Christians there will either be no King at all, or he will be the public servant : if he clearly wants to be Lord, he cannot at the same time be a Christian." *Chapter III.*

Dissimulation :—" No one desires to appear what he ought not to be." *Chapter III.*

Right of Kingship :—" By Nature there is no right of succession ; by Nature no one is King unless it be he who excels others in wisdom and courage : others are Kings by force or faction, against Nature, when they ought rather to be servants. For Nature gives to every very wise man rule over the less wise, but not rule to a stupid man over wise men : wherefore whoever take away rule from stupid persons act wholly in agreement with Nature." *Chapter V.*

A Critical Rule :—" Poets generally put their own sense into the mouths of their best characters." *Chapter V.*

Julius Cæsar :—" Truly, if I should wish any tyrant to have been spared, it would be he; for, though he introduced kingly government into a free state in a rather violent manner, he was perhaps the worthiest of being King." *Chapter V.*

Worth of Authority:—"You say '*Then Seneca's description of the three conditions will fall to the ground.*' *Let* Seneca fall to the ground, and let *us* be free." *Chapter VI.*

The English Army and the Treaty of Newport:—"On which but one observation occurs to me, which I make unwillingly: that our Army had more correct political perceptions than our Parliament men, and saved by their arms the State which the others had nearly ruined by their votes." *Chapter I.*

Parallel between James I. and Solomon:—"There are some, to tell the truth, who do not hesitate to compare James with Solomon, and even to think him superior in the circumstances of his birth. Solomon, they will tell you, was the son of David, who was formerly the musician of Saul; but then James was the son of Lord Darnley, who *killed* the musician David, not long after he had found him inside the Queen's bedchamber with the door bolted, as Buchanan relates. James was therefore the more illustrious in the matter of parentage, and is consequently often called the Second Solomon, notwithstanding that it is doubtful whether he was actually the Son of David the musician." *Chapter II.*

Parallel between Charles I. and Solomon:—"But how it came into your head, Salmasius, to compare Solomon with Charles I do not see. For, though you exalt Charles with so many praises, I find, at the very moment while I am writing this, that his own son, a Charles too, is confessing and deploring, on that stool of repentance among the Scots, publicly before the people, his father's obstinacy, avarice, cruelty, and harsh lordship over all pious and good men, his wars, his ravages by fire, his rapine, and his numberless slaughters of his poor subjects. *He*, certainly, forswears that *regium jus* of yours. But, if you so delight in parallels, let us compare Charles with Solomon. Solomon came to the throne by the well-merited punishment of his brother; Charles by the death of his father—I will not say by his murder, though all the signs of poison were seen in the father's corpse, pointing suspicion to Buckingham, while Charles, nevertheless, though he was the slayer of the King his father, not only absolved him from all indictment in the States, but dissolved those States lest the entire matter should be subjected to Parliamentary investigation. Solomon oppressed the people with heavy taxes; but he spent the proceeds on the Temple of God and public buildings, while Charles spent the like on luxurious living. Solomon was enticed to the worship of idols by many wives; Charles by one. Solomon so enticed is not heard of as enticing others into the deception; Charles not only enticed others by the fattest rewards of a corrupt Church, but even forced them by edicts and ecclesiastical canons, to the scandal of all the Reformed, to erect statues and adore painted crucifixes set up on walls over altars." *Chapter II.*

Charles and Nero:—"Your fondness for collecting the most silly parallels forces me to correct you; and I will show you how like to Nero Charles was. Nero, you say, killed his own mother with the sword. Well, Charles killed his Father and King by poison; for, to omit other evidences, it could not be but that he who rescued from the laws the Duke who was guilty of the poisoning was himself also guilty.[1] Nero slew many thousand Christians; Charles many more. There were not wanting, Suetonius tells us, people who praised Nero after his death, regretted him, for a long time adorned his tomb with spring and summer flowers, and prophesied all sorts of evils to his enemies; there are not wanting those who regret Charles as insanely, and extol him with boundless praises." *Chapter V.*

Private Character of Charles:—"Can you praise his chastity and continence whom we know to have been steeped in all kinds of viciousness with the Duke of Buckingham? What need to ferret out his secrecies and retirements, when he used in the theatre to put his arm round the waists of women in a wanton way and kiss them, and in public to fondle the bosoms of girls and matrons, or even worse (*virginum et matronarum papillas, ne dicam cœtera, pertractare*)? I give you warning, my Pseudoplutarch, to give up comparisons of that sort in future, lest I should be obliged to tell about Charles things that I would otherwise willingly keep to myself." *Chapter IV.*

Comfort for the Presbyterians:—"Coming back to the question who were the authors of the King's punishment, you say '*If the business is rightly considered on its own evidence through and*

---

[1] This atrocious charge, which Milton was not above countenancing, and which he repeats here more strongly than in the last passage quoted, had been circulated or insinuated in some of the most virulent Anti-Royalist pamphlets while Charles was yet alive.

through, the close of the infamous action ought therefore to be imputed to the Independents, as the credit of its beginnings and progress may be claimed by the Presbyterians.' Hear that, my Presbyterian friends ! What good now, what will it conduce to your reputation for blamelessness and loyalty, that you appeared to shrink in such horror from the punishment of the King at last? You, on the accusation of this most wordy King's advocate, '*went more than half way on the road ;*' you '*to the fourth act and farther in the performance of this drama were seen twittering on the stage,*' you '*ought to be marked with the crime of having killed the King, as having shown the way to killing him,*' you, and no others, '*brought down that abominable axe upon his neck.*' Woe to *you,* first of all, if ever after this the progeny of Charles shall recover the Kingdom of the English ! All this, believe me, is marked up against *you* in the account-book ! " *Chapter X.*

Cromwell's Irish successes :—" That the most valiant Cromwell should be the leader of our army, and that, encircled by a joyful body-guard of friends, not without the favour and good wishes of the public, and with the prayers of all good men following him, he should have set out for a war in Ireland most agreeable to God, was, I am glad to know, the reverse of agreeable to your party; and now, after the news of his so many victories, I imagine them in the last stage of spleen." *Chapter VI.*

Defective form of the English Commonwealth :—" As for the present form of our Commonwealth . . . . let me say that it is such a form as the times and our disagreements will stand, not such as might be wished, but such as the obstinate disaffection of bad citizens will allow to exist. A Republic that labours under the perplexity of factions and is defending itself by arms is sufficiently just if it takes account of the sound and right-minded part of the community, and passes by and excludes others, whether commoners or nobles." *Preface.*

After all, though there are such passages and points of general or Miltonic interest in the *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio,* its main interest lies now, as it did at the time, in the terrific onslaught made in it on Salmasius personally. That this was to be Milton's policy in the pamphlet throughout will have appeared from what we have quoted from the Preface ; but how mercilessly the policy was carried out can be learnt only from a perusal of the whole book. *Fool*, *beetle*, *ass*, *blockhead*, *liar*, *slanderer*, *apostate*, *idiot*, *wretch*, *ignoramus*, *vagabond*, *French vagabond*, *Burgundian slave:* these or their equivalents are the epithets applied to Salmasius, page after page, and almost sentence after sentence, with marvellous recklessness, and yet a most curious fertility and ingenuity in Latin Billingsgate. Every now and then, lest the mere successive smarts of these epithets, coming at irregular intervals, should not be enough, the lashing is made continuous for a sentence or two, the subject being stopped for that amount of private attention to Salmasius; and three or four times there is a still longer stoppage, and King, Commonwealth, and Bishops wait for some minutes, while Salmasius is tied up. With a ferocious instinct for what will give the victim most pain, the two topics with which he is most systematically twitted, when others fail, are his Latinity and his wife. The gossip that had reached Milton from Leyden was that the great scholar was dreadfully under subjection to Madame Salmasius—the Anne Mercier whom he had married in Paris in 1623,—and that in fact it was the high Royalist politics of this lady, her scorn for anything low or Republican, that had compelled him to lend his pen to the Stadtholder and Charles II. in the English controversy. Hence, whenever Milton wants to be particularly poignant in his abuse, and to vary the form of it from sneers at the bad or bald Latin of Salmasius, or the silliness of his scholarship, he brings in Madame Salmasius. It is in such cases, but indeed pretty generally throughout, that one asks whether such licence in personal scurrility was worthy of Milton. That he was right in the general policy of his book there can be no doubt. Salmasius had come forth as the exponent of a doctrine of Kingship loathsomely absurd, but not the less operative at that day, and had put his name and reputation at the disposal of Charles II. for the propagation of that doctrine and the formation of a European league in his and its interest against the English Commonwealth. To show what his name and reputation were really worth, to push through the book to the personality that gave it credit, to fetch out Salmasius himself from the book, as it were on a fork, so that he might be held up, and one might say, pointing to him, "This is the creature that tells you so and so," was therefore, in the circumstances, not only the most speedy and effective, but also quite a fair, mode of reasoning. There are decencies and limits, however, in civilized warfare; and, with all allowance for the customs of controversy in Milton's time, one cannot always excuse him. Our business, however, is with facts as they are; and here are one or two specimens of his invective, with the fair and the unfair mixed:—

SALMASIUS AND HIS LEARNING:—"Who are you that bark at us? You a *learned* man, who seem rather to have been turning over lexicons and glossaries and collections of extracts all your life than to have read good authors with judgment and profit; whence your chatter is of nothing but codices, and various readings, and disarrangements and corruptions of text, while you show that you have not imbibed even the smallest drop of more real learning? You a *wise* man, who are constantly quarrelling about the merest minutiæ, and carrying on beggarly wars, and making railing attacks, now on astronomers, now on medical men, of good credit in their respective sciences, though yourself without skill or accomplishment in either; who, if any one should try to snatch from you the petty glory of a little word or a little letter restored by you in some copy, would interdict him, if you could, from fire and water? And yet you are angry, and yet you show your teeth, because people all call you a Grammarian. In some trifling book of yours you openly call Hammond, the most beloved and favoured of the late King's chaplains, a rascal, merely because he had called you a Grammarian; and you would be ready, I believe, to say the same of the King himself, and to retract this whole defence of him, if you heard that he had approved of his chaplain's criticism of you. Take notice then how I, one of those English whom you dare to describe as 'fanatical, unlearned, obscure, blackguardly,' do here on my private account (for that the English Nation itself should publicly think anything at all about a weevil like you would be a degradation)—do here, I say, on my private account, despise you and make a laughing-stock of you, declaring that, turn you upside-down, downside-up, round-about, or anyhow, you are still nothing but a Grammarian; ay, and that, as if you had made a more foolish wish to some god than even Midas did, whatever you touch, except when you commit solecisms, is still only grammar. Whoever, then, of those 'dregs of the common people' that you so denounce (for those truly noble men among us whose wisdom, virtue, and nobility are proved by their illustrious acts, I will not so dishonour as to think of comparing you to them or them to you)—whoever, I say, of these dregs of the common people has only persuaded himself to this principle, that he was not born for Kings, but for God and his country, is a far more learned, far wiser, far better, man than you are, and deserves to be esteemed of far greater worth to all time. For he is learned without letters; you have letters, but no learning, who know so many languages, turn over so many volumes, write so many yourself, and are but a sheep after all." *Chapter I.*

SALMASIUS AND MADAME SALMASIUS :—"It is sufficiently clear that you did not so much throw your mind into the Royal Cause from your own inclination as let yourself be hired, partly by the money you had (a very large sum, too, for the means of him who hired you), partly by the hope of some greater reward, to libel the English in an infamous book, though they were troubling none of their neighbours, but only deciding on their own affairs. Were it not so, is it credible that any one should be so impudent or mad as, though distant from us and a foreigner, to mix himself up of his own accord with our affairs and not hesitate to join himself to a party? For what the devil is it to you what the English do among themselves? . . . Have you nothing at home to occupy you? . . . Did that Hotspur of a wife of yours, who is said to have driven you to write in favour of the exiled Charles, hold out prospects for you of ampler professorial appointments in England, and I know not what other emoluments, on Charles's return? But know, both Wife and Husband, that there is no place in England either for Wolf or for Wolf's master [*neque Lupo neque Lupi Domino:* the reference being to St. Lou or St. Lupus in France, where Salmasius had some property]. No wonder then that you so often break into foaming rages against the 'English mastiffs' as you call us. Why don't you return to your illustrious titles in France, first of all to your hunger-starved lordship of Lupus, and next to the sacred Council-Chamber of His most Christian Majesty? Surely, for a Councillor, you are too far away from your country. But your country, as I plainly see, desires neither you nor your counsels, and did not do so even when you returned a few years ago and had begun to hang sniffing about my Lord Cardinal's kitchen; and your country, by my faith, is right, quite right, and may, with great ease, allow you to run about hither and thither, a French kind of half-man, with your man-wife attached to you, and your wallets choke-full of trifles, till you shall find, somewhere in the world, a stipend large enough for a Knight-grammatist or a Horse-critic, if any king or state is in the mind to bid for a vagabond doctor that is for sale at a good price." *Chapter VIII.*

HOW SALMASIUS ACQUIRED HIS KNOWLEDGE OF ENGLISH:—"We are greatly delighted with your Anglicisms: *County Court*, *The Turn*, *The Hundred*, &c. With admirable aptitude for scholarship you have learnt to count your hundred Jacobuses in English.

Who told Salmasius what is meant by *Hundred*,
And taught his magpie-mouth to try our phrases?
Schoolmaster Belly, and the hundred Jameses
Squeezed from the poor pouch of the exiled king.
Set but before him money's deceitful glitter,
And he who proved the Pope was Antichrist,
And vowed to blast his Primacy to atoms,
Will sit amidst the Cardinals a-singing."[1]

Chapter VIII.

A FAREWELL TO SALMASIUS:—"At last, after your measureless loquacity, you close your dams, calling God to witness that you '*undertook the defence of this cause not merely because you were asked, but because your conscience told you that you could not possibly have found a better to defend.*' Are you, at any asking, when certainly not at ours, to intrude yourself into our concerns, with which you have nothing to do? Are you to libel with the foulest words of abuse, and slash in an infamous printed book, the chief magistrates of the English People, performing within their jurisdiction their proper duties, according to the authority and power entrusted to them, and that without the least injury done you by them, for indeed they did not know that you were born? But by whom were you asked? Was it by your wife, who, as they give out, exercises royal rights over you? Or were you asked perchance by Charles the Less and his profligate gang of refugee-courtiers, and sent for as another Balaam by another King Balak, that you might exert yourself to raise up by bad writing the fallen cause of the King that had been lost by bad fighting? So it may have been; but there was a difference. *He* came to the business of cursing, a knowing man, seated on an ass that could speak; *you*, an eternally speaking ass, ridden by a woman, and surrounded by the healed heads of the Bishops that you had once broken, present rather a certain small resemblance to the Beast in the Apocalypse. But they say that you repented of this book a little after you had written it. That is well; and, to witness, therefore, your repentance to all, there will be nothing fitter for you to do than, in atonement for so long a book, to make but one long dangling letter of your own carcase. So repented that Judas Iscariot whom you are like; and that the boy Charles knew, and on that account sent you the gift of a purse, the badge of the Judas traitor, because he had first heard, and then saw, that you were an Apostate and a Devil. Judas betrayed Christ, you the Church of Christ; you had taught that Bishops are Antichrists, and you have deserted to them; those that you had damned to hell you have undertaken to plead for; Christ set all men free, and you have tried to reduce all to slavery: doubt not, since you have been thus impious to God, to the Church, to the whole race of men, but the same exit awaits also you, so that, induced by despair rather than repentance, and utterly weary of yourself, hanging at last from some luckless tree, you shall, as he did who was your match, burst asunder in the midst, and send before you that faithless and cheating soul of yours, the reviler of the good and the holy, to the place of punishment sometime prepared for you."[1] *Chapter XII.*

---

[1] This Latin epigram, now generally printed among Milton's Latin poems, under the title *In Salmasii Hundredam*, is an adaptation of the last seven lines of the Prologue to the Satires of Persius.

Such was the book that was passing through Dugard's press, and the blow from which was to descend in a week or two on the head of Salmasius. The great man, the reader must now be informed, was no longer at Leyden.

There is something like evidence that the *Defensio Regia* had made the position of Salmasius in Leyden less comfortable in 1650 than it had been before. There were two parties among the Dutch, as we know,—the old Republican party, and the Orange or Monarchical party of the Stadtholder; and, even before the death of the Stadtholder, the former party had made its influence felt in the question of the English alliance. The two Provincial States of Holland and West Friesland, where the party was in fullest strength, had, as we have seen, dissented from the anti-English policy of the States-General, and had entered into separate negotiations with the Commonwealth, and sent over an envoy of their own to London (May 1650), who had been well received and had given every satisfaction. As Leyden is in South Holland, a few miles from the Hague, Salmasius must have been aware, by many signs, that he had brought unpopularity on himself in that part of the United Provinces by his book and its doctrines; and, indeed, as we learn from the Preface to Milton's answer, the States of Holland, in their anxiety to be on good terms with the English, now publicly condemned Salmasius's book, and had passed an edict forbidding its farther sale. On the whole, therefore, whatever compensation there may have been in the continued countenance of the Stadtholder and his partisans, a removal, at least for a time, from Leyden, and even out of the United Provinces altogether, had become desirable for Salmasius. Nor was he in doubt where to go. There was one potentate of Europe, still farther north, who was dying for the honour of possessing him.

---

[1] Really, after reading such a passage as this last, one is disposed to think there may be something in an explanation I have seen suggested: viz. that Milton was laughing grimly all the while, wishing no such tremendous end at all for the body and soul of poor Salmasius, but only showing his skill in a kind of composition (known among the old Scottish poets by the name of *A Flyting*) the understood law of which was boundlessness of bad language. Only to this passage, however, would I apply such a notion of hyperbolic irony. The invective, for the rest, is serious enough.

Who has not heard of Queen Christina of Sweden? Only six years of age at the death of her heroic father, Gustavus Adolphus, in 1632, she had been educated, as that hero had intended, and had himself arranged, on Amazonian principles, with a view to fit her for a man's part in the succession to the Swedish monarchy and its connexions with Europe. Before the cessation of the Regency of Chancellor Oxenstiern, and her accession to the active sovereignty in 1644, at the age of eighteen, she had been heard of everywhere as an astonishing young beauty, an eccentric, a girl of genius, who could read Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and several modern tongues besides her own, scorned the usual pursuits and even the dress of her own sex, was skilled in all manly exercises and sciences, could review troops on horseback and direct their manœuvres, and had also a head for statesmanship. Since then she had finished a war with Denmark, taken part in the negotiations by which the Thirty Years' War was closed in the Peace of Westphalia (1648), and received by that Peace some accession to her territories. She had declared herself, with the utmost vehemence, against the idea of marriage with anybody whatsoever, and had taken at her coronation the title of "King." Her ruling passion, since the Peace of Westphalia, had been to collect books and manuscripts, correspond with all the most celebrated artists, scholars, philosophers, and men of science, of all the countries of Europe, and persuade as many of them as she could to come, or to promise to come, to her Court of Stockholm. Poor Descartes, whom she had induced, after some years of correspondence with him, to make Sweden his asylum, and be her counsellor and instructor in Philosophy, had fallen a victim to the climate after a few months, and had died there in Feb. 1650, when only in the fifty-fourth year of his age. Among other foreigners then at her court, and pensioned by her, or employed by her in one capacity or another, were the German Freinsheim, her librarian, and the two Dutch scholars, Isaac Vossius and Nicolas Heinsius; but she was luring thither the French Samuel Bochart, the French Huet, the French Naudet, and one knows not how many more of those literary correspondents of hers in various lands who were already in a manner her clients, and were sending her panegyrics in which she was styled "The Tenth Muse," "The new Sybil of the North," "The Miracle of Nature," "The Heavenly Heroine." But what were all these for her young Majesty of the Snows without the great Salmasius? "All that number of illustrious and learned "men," says the biographer of Salmasius, "could not satisfy "her mind, athirst for learning, unless Salmasius were joined "to them. She invited him therefore in most friendly "letters to come to her as soon as possible, for that she "was burning with the desire of seeing and hearing him. "Meanwhile, till he should get ready to come, that no time, "no opportunity, of learning anything from him, should slip "away, she begged the privilege (these are her very words) "'of corresponding with him by letter, and consulting him "about her studies.' They, accordingly, from that time, "exchanged frequent and most familiar letters, she writing "good long ones, mostly in Latin, often of several pages, "and sometimes of six or seven. But, when our hero was "still delaying the journey for some time, chiefly from his "dread of injury to his health by the very cold air of that "country, and the extreme inclemency of the winter, which "he would have to pass entirely there, she at last intimated to "him that either he must make more haste or she must go "to him; which she declared she would actually have done "already, if considerations of her position and the convenience "of her Kingdom had allowed it." All this, we are to suppose, had been before 1650, and perhaps before the publication of the *Defensio Regia*. In the month of July 1650, the very time at which we have seen reason to believe that a temporary absence from Leyden was independently desirable for Salmasius, he did, his biographer adds, obtain leave of absence from the curators of the Leyden University, and set out for Stockholm. "With what kindness, with what courtesy, with "what honour, he was received by the Queen," proceeds the enthusiastic Salmasian, "it would be too long to relate here. "To state the whole matter compendiously, she did for him "everything that could be expected from an equal. It was "her wish that he should select apartments in her Palace, "that she might always be at his side when she wanted. "But, because our hero could not stand the climate, he was "almost always confined to his room. She, nevertheless, "would come to his bedside, and there hold various and long-"continued conversations with him on matters of the greatest "importance, and that without any others being present, so "that, all the doors being shut, she would herself make up the "fire and perform whatever other offices were necessary for "the poor gentleman in his bed." One morning, as we learn from another source, the Queen, coming into his bedroom, with her attendants, found him reading a book, which he tried hastily to hide, because it was *libellus subturpiculus*, a slightly improper kind of little book. She got it into her hands, however, read a little herself, and then made one of her attendants, a beautiful girl named Sparra, read some passages aloud, she and the rest laughing, while the poor girl blushed.—Where, one asks, was Madame Salmasius? She had certainly accompanied her husband to Sweden, for she had superintended his first presentation to Queen Christina in scarlet breeches, with a black hat and a white feather, and in contemporary letters of gossip from Stockholm one hears of her, under the name of *Mercera,* as figuring no less there than elsewhere in her double capacity as her husband's domineering master and the sharp guardian of his interests and fighter of his battles. Indeed they had taken their two sons with them, Claude de Saumaise and Josias de Saumaise, that these young gentlemen might be naturalized in Sweden, and make their fortunes there.[1]

It was at Stockholm, therefore, with his family about him, and the splendid young Queen Christina attending on him as his worshipper and waiting-maid, that the blow from Milton's London book was to descend upon Salmasius.

---

[1] Arkenholtz: Mémoires concernant Christine, Reine de Suède (1751), I. 222, et seq.; Clementius "De Laudibus et Vita Salmasii," pp. li.—lii.; a quotation from Huetius by Mitford in his Life of Milton (Pickering's Milton, I. p. lxx., note); and correspondence of Isaac Vossius and Nicolas Heinsius in Burmann's Sylloge Epistolarum (1727).

CHAPTER V.

ANNALS OF THE COMMONWEALTH: THIRD YEAR, FEB. 18, 1650–1—DEC. 1, 1651.

NEW COUNCIL OF STATE: RELATIONS WITH SPAIN: NEGOTIATION WITH THE PORTUGUESE AMBASSADOR: EMBASSY OF ST. JOHN AND STRICKLAND TO THE UNITED PROVINCES: AFFAIRS IN SCOTLAND: CROMWELL'S ILLNESS THERE: EFFECTS OF THE ENGLISH OCCUPATION AMONG THE SCOTS: STATE OF SCOTLAND NORTH OF THE FIRTHS: CHARLES II. AND HIS SCOTTISH COURT: PARLIAMENT AT PERTH AND STIRLING: DECLINE OF THE ARGYLE INFLUENCE: *RESOLUTIONERS* AND *REMONSTRANTS*: CHARLES'S SCOTTISH ARMY: DISGRACE OF LORD HOWARD OF ESCRICK: ENGLISH PRESBYTERIAN CONSPIRACY FOR CHARLES II.: CASE OF MR. LOVE AND MR. GIBBONS: CROMWELL'S MARCH UPON STIRLING: ACCESS BLOCKED BY LESLIE: DEVICE OF A PASSAGE THROUGH FIFESHIRE: CROMWELL AT PERTH: SUDDEN MARCH OF CHARLES AND THE SCOTS INTO ENGLAND: CROMWELL'S RAPID PURSUIT: EXCITEMENT THROUGHOUT ENGLAND: EXECUTION OF LOVE AND GIBBONS: BATTLE OF WORCESTER: THE CAPTIVES AND FUGITIVES: CONQUEST OF SCOTLAND COMPLETED BY MONK: NEW HONOURS FOR CROMWELL: EXECUTION OF THE EARL OF DERBY AND OTHERS: SCOTTISH PRISONERS IN ENGLAND: ESCAPE OF CHARLES II.: THE MARQUIS OF ARGYLE IN SCOTLAND: VIEW OF HIS CHARACTER AND CAREER: DECREE FOR THE INCORPORATION OF SCOTLAND WITH THE COMMONWEALTH: CLEMENT HOME

POLICY AFTER WORCESTER: NAVIGATION ACT AGAINST THE DUTCH: CROMWELL'S MOTION FOR ASSIGNING A TERM TO THE RUMP PARLIAMENT: MOTION CARRIED: VICTORIOUS CLOSE OF THE THIRD YEAR OF THE COMMONWEALTH.

For reasons not assigned, this third Council of State was to hold office only for nine months and a half, ceasing on Dec. 1, 1651, and not on Feb. 18, 1651–2, which would have been the regular twelvemonth's term. The twenty-one reappointed members were—Cromwell, Chief Justices St. John and Rolle, Lords Commissioners Whitlocke and Lisle, Serjeant Bradshaw, Lord Grey of Groby, Vane, Hasilrig, Pickering, Masham, Armyn, Mildmay, Harrington, Skippon, Walton, Purefoy, Scott, Bond, Challoner, and Gurdon. The first nineteen of these had been members of both the two preceding Councils; the last two only of the second. Among the members of the *two* preceding Councils *not* reappointed on this one were Fairfax (retired from public life since June 1650), Henry Marten, Alderman Pennington, and Ludlow; and among members of the *last* Council now omitted were Lord Howard and Sir Peter Wentworth. The twenty absolutely new members were:—

Alderman Francis Allen.
* Sir John Bourchier, Knt.
Sir William Brereton, Bart.
* John Carew, Esq.
* William Cawley, Esq.
Henry Darley, Esq.
John Fielden, Esq.
Lieut.-Gen. Charles Fleetwood.
Robert Goodwin, Esq.
* Major-Gen. Thomas Harrison.
William Lemon, Esq.
Thomas Lister, Esq.
Nicholas Love, Esq.
Edmund Prideaux, Esq. (*Attorney General*).
Major Richard Salway.
* William Say, Esq.
Walter Strickland, Esq. (late Agent at the Hague).
George Thompson, Esq.
Sir John Trevor, Knt.
Sir Thomas Widdrington, Knt.

All of these were members of Parliament; and those asterisked had signed the death-warrant of Charles I.

At the first meeting of the Council (Feb. 19, 1650–1), Walter Frost, junior, was reappointed assistant to his father, whose reappointment to the General Secretaryship had been made, as before, by Parliament itself, and Milton was reappointed Secretary for Foreign Languages. At the meeting on March 1, the standing Committees of Council were appointed or reappointed. There were now seven such Committees, for these departments respectively—*Ordnance*, *Admiralty*, *Affairs of Ireland and Scotland*, *Examinations and Informations*, *Conference with Army-officers*, *Law*, and *The Mint;* and among these the members of the Council were distributed according to their tastes or qualifications, some to serve on two or more Committees. Of the larger Committees *three* were to be a quorum, and of the smaller *two.* Renewed precautions for secrecy of the proceedings, by locked doors, &c., are very conspicuous at the beginning of this Council.[1]

Besides Cromwell, whose re-nomination on the Council in his absence had been again a matter of course, there were several others whose attendance at Council or its Committees could not be expected for some time. Lord Commissioner St. John and Mr. Strickland, for example, who had been appointed Ambassadors Extraordinary to the United Provinces, took their formal leave of Parliament on the 25th of February, before their departure, with all befitting state and ceremony, on their important mission. On the same day, in proof that the negotiations in London with the Spanish Ambassador Cardenas had been so far satisfactory, it was resolved by the House to send one or more Ambassadors from the Commonwealth to the Court of Madrid. They were not yet named, however; and the business of intercourse between the two nations was to be managed for some time longer, as hitherto, between the friendly Cardenas and the chiefs of the Commonwealth conferring in London. The murder of Ascham was still a subject of discussion; but, on the whole, his Spanish Majesty was understood to be now very well disposed towards the Commonwealth. His Majesty's relations at the time to other continental powers, including Portugal, were such as to make this policy prudent; and it must have been good news to him to learn in Madrid how indifferently the Portuguese

---

[1] Notes from Council Order Books of days named.

Envoy had succeeded in London in comparison with his own Ambassador, Cardenas.[1]

The negotiation with Guimaraes in London, indeed, was a most protracted affair. Begun at the close of the second year of the Commonwealth, it had been handed on into the third, a Committee of the Council of State, with Mr. Charles Vane and Milton in constant attendance, managing the treaty with Guimaraes directly, both by interviews and by exchange of papers, but the Council itself and the Parliament reviewing and superintending. Through the month of April 1651 the treaty occupied much of the time both of the Council and of the House. On certain preliminary articles, including the release of Englishmen imprisoned in Portugal, the restoration of English ships and goods taken by the Portuguese in retaliation for Blake's ravages, the reparation of damages caused by the protection given to Rupert's piratical navy, and even security for the payment by the King of Portugal of £180,000 towards England's expenses in the late war, there was not much difficulty; but on some important ulterior points there was a contest of firmness and ingenuity between the Parliament and the Envoy, the Parliament again and again voting the Envoy's offers to be unsatisfactory, and the Envoy again and again maintaining his ground in papers. The Treaty having prolonged itself into May, and Guimaraes, after repeated references to him, still evading what was demanded, Parliament at length (May 16) declared the Treaty to be absolutely broken off, and ordered a pass to be sent to Guimaraes for his departure out of the territories of the Commonwealth within fourteen days. Even after that Guimaraes made some attempts to renew the negotiation, but in vain. It was to be made clear to Portugal and to all the world that the English Commonwealth could be as dictatorial as the most absolute potentate in Europe.[2]

More really a disappointment to the heads of the Commonwealth than the broken treaty with Portugal was the failure of the Embassy of Chief Justice St. John and Mr. Strickland to the States-General of the Netherlands. They had been accompanied by a train of gentlemen in attendance, as well as servants, and had taken with them for their secretary JOHN THURLOE, a Lincoln's Inn lawyer, then thirty-four years of age, who had been in St. John's confidential employment for many years, and had served also, by his recommendation, in various public posts. They entered the Hague in a procession of twenty-seven coaches, with 246 followers on foot; and they had their first audience of the States-General on the 20th of March. Their hope, and that of the Parliament at home, was that the new political condition of the United Provinces, brought about by the recent death of the Prince of Orange, would prove favourable to their mission. The Republican party, on whose sympathies the English Commonwealth might naturally count, were now in power, and were taking advantage of the infancy of the heir of the Orange line for the perpetuation of that power, and the protection of Republican institutions from future encroachments. The Stadtholderate, which had been virtually hereditary in the Orange line since the foundation of the Republic, was now in abeyance, and the Orange interest politically depressed. Still the Orange party was numerous, and in great favour with the populace in the Hague and in other towns; and whatever this party could do to thwart the Embassy from the English Commonwealth was sure to be done, not only because of the sympathy of the party with the Stuart dynasty in England, but also because the alliance with the English Commonwealth which the Ambassadors had come to propose threatened to be fatal to all chance of a renewal of the Orange Stadtholderate. Hardly had the Ambassadors arrived, indeed, when they had very unpleasant experience of this. Their coaches were pursued and hooted in the streets; the windows of their hotel were broken over and over again; there were scuffles between the Hague people and their servants; Prince Edward, a younger son of the Queen of Bohemia, passing them in the Park, called out "O you rogues, you dogs"; there were rumours of plots against their lives; altogether it did not seem impossible that St. John and Strickland, Ambassadors Extraordinary though they were, and splendid as was their retinue, might meet the fate of poor Dorislaus and Ascham. The insults and affronts came chiefly, of course, from the English Royalist refugees or their personal connexions; but they were abetted by the Orange party among the Dutch. With great bravery and dignity, the Ambassadors, while making due complaint of the insults and affronts to the proper authorities, persevered, in spite of them, in the real business of their mission. Here, however, they did not find that the ideas of even the most friendly Dutch Statesmen had risen quite to the level of the occasion. There was profuse expression of respect for the English Commonwealth, and the States-General omitted nothing that could possibly be done to atone for the insults to the Ambassadors and to prevent their repetition. Prince Edward, called to account for his behaviour to them, had to banish himself from the United Provinces. That intimate and complete alliance with England, however, which was the object of the Embassy—an alliance intended actually to unite the English and Dutch peoples in one Republic—was a prospect for which the Dutch mind was not prepared. Would not Dutch interests suffer in such an alliance; would not the United Provinces, if attached to England, sink from the position of an independent power into that of a mere province of the rich commercial Island? In vain did St. John and Strickland combat these fears; in vain did they bring forward the proposed alliance in a form the most likely to be welcome. The hesitations of the Dutch Republican statesmen, watched as they were by their opponents of the Orange party, were not to be overcome. On the 20th of June, 1651, therefore, St. John and Strickland, after three months of residence at the Hague, took their leave. In their last audience with the Committee of the States-General St. John conveyed his mind in a very frank and memorable speech. He perceived, he said, that their High Mightinesses of the States-General were waiting for the issue of affairs in Scotland, before finally deciding on their policy towards England. Well, let their High Mightinesses take his parting assurance that the war in Scotland would be finished by Lord General Cromwell very soon indeed, and that the United Provinces of the Netherlands would then repent that their statesmen had not accepted the generous offers of the English Commonwealth! Altogether the Embassy, though unsuccessful, had been conducted to the end with thoroughly Roman dignity; and on the 2nd of July, when the Ambassadors reappeared in the English Parliament, and gave a full account of their proceedings, they and the rest of the gentlemen of the Embassy were very specially thanked.[1]

---

[1] Commons Journals of date given; Godwin, III. 369, and 375—6.

[2] Commons Journals and Council Order Books of many days in April and May 1651—those in the C. J. traceable in the Index, under *Guimaraes*; Godwin, III. 369—370.

The issue of affairs in Scotland would probably have been apparent to their High Mightinesses by this time, but for one cause of delay. Cromwell, to whose other honours had been added the succession to the late Earl of Pembroke in the Chancellorship of the University of Oxford (Jan. 1, 1650–1), had been seriously, even alarmingly, ill. Early in February, setting out from Edinburgh to Stirling, to open the year's campaign, he and his army had encountered such a tempest of rain, hail, and sleet as to be forced to return; and an ague or fever which Cromwell had caught in that march had hung about him for the next four months. There had been much anxiety in London on his account; and, after one of his relapses in May, the Council of State, by desire of the Parliament, had despatched two of the most eminent London physicians, Dr. Wright and Dr. Bates, with an apothecary, to see him in Edinburgh, and add their advice to that of Dr. Goddard, the physician already in attendance. At the time when they went it was fully believed that his recovery in the sharp Scottish climate would be impossible; and on the 27th of May Parliament passed a resolution that he should be requested to remove to some part of England, "until, by the blessing of God upon the means used, he be restored to a condition of health and strength." In June, however, when the two London physicians had returned, to receive from the Council a fee of £200 each, the apothecary at the same time receiving £40, it was understood that Cromwell was beginning to be himself again, and that his removal to England would not be necessary. Meanwhile, save for such business as the invalid could attend to when he was not quite prostrate, but could even manage a journey from Edinburgh to Glasgow and back, about four months had been practically lost by his illness. During those four months (Feb.—June 1651) Scotland remained in that state of division into two parts in which we left it at the end of the previous year. All south of the Firths of Forth and Clyde was virtually a province of the English Commonwealth, supervised by Cromwell; all north of the Firths was the Scotland of Charles II. and the Government that had gathered round him.[1]

---

[1] Godwin, III. 375—380; Parl. Hist. III. 1364—5; Commons Journals of April 11 and July 2, 1651. Documents relating to the Embassy of St. John and Strickland, with the Proposals they made to the States General, are given in Thurloe, I. pp. 175—195.

The four months of inaction in the field were not unimportant months for that part of Scotland which Cromwell supervised. Indeed, from the time of the Battle of Dunbar the presence of the victorious English Army of Sectaries in Edinburgh and its vicinity had been producing decided effects on Scottish opinion and on Scottish morals. People had been a good deal shocked at first by some features in the behaviour of the Sectaries. Naturally, in seizing castles and other places of strength round Edinburgh, they had been a little rough, doing damages to furniture, trees, and crops, which rumour magnified into pillage and devastation. They had not been very respectful even to the insides of churches and other public buildings, when they were hard pressed for fuel, or when they wanted stables or barrack-room. The buildings of Edinburgh University, the High School, and three of the city churches, had suffered in this way; and a peculiarly lamentable incident of the first months of their possession of the city had been a fire (Nov. 13, 1650) in Holyrood Palace, through the carelessness of some soldiers, by which the greater portion of that historical old edifice was destroyed, and only one interesting fragment of it, containing Queen Mary's apartments, was left for the inspection of posterity. All this, however, had happened while Cromwell was yet only fixing himself in his conquest; and, as soon as that process was complete, and his Army had been brought into its usual order, the Scots of the Lothians had begun to find him and his troops not so bad as had been reported. The clergy, indeed, still maintained their pulpit mutterings against the "sectaries and blasphemers"; but not a few important laymen had learnt better things of Cromwell and his officers. In short, the English occupation of the South of Scotland in 1650–1 had imported into that part of Scotland information and ideas that were very much needed. Even in morals, if Cromwell's account is true, the Scottish Presbyterians about Edinburgh had much to learn from the example of an army of religious, cleanly, and truthful Englishmen. "I "thought I should have found in Scotland a conscientious "people and a barren country," he had written to President Bradshaw, Sept. 25, 1650: "about Edinburgh [on the con-"trary] it is as fertile for corn as any part of England, but "the people are so given to the most impudent lying and "frequent swearing as is incredible to be believed." Perhaps it had begun to dawn on some of them since then that personal integrity and decency of speech were virtues to be cultivated on their own account, apart from the question of Kirk-orthodoxy. At all events, the stringent machinery of the Presbyterian Kirk-system itself had been broken down, and new lights obtained on that whole subject. Liberty of preaching, and of the administration of the Presbyterian discipline, was allowed by Cromwell to the Scottish clergy, within the limits required by English rule and regard for individual freedom; but the fact that there were such limits was a considerable relaxation of the tremendous recent grasp of the Kirk upon the bodies and souls of her children. Moreover, there was now another ministry among the Scots, competing with that of their own Kirk. There were the eminent English Independent pastors that had accompanied the army; there were the praying and preaching officers and soldiers of various Puritan creeds, all very earnest in using that liberty of meeting for worship, discourse, and debate, which was the cherished privilege of the English Army, dignified occasionally by the example of the Lord General himself. What missionaries these among the Scots, and what dread among the Presbyterian clergy as to the consequences! The mass of the people, it is true, still stood firm to the Kirk and the Covenant, and there are traditions of debates between Kirk-men and the Sectaries in which the Kirk-men triumphed. But it is also on the records of the Kirk that many erred and ran after the new doctrines. The abominable notion of Toleration reared its head openly; some began to "vilipend" the Covenant itself as a mere human institution, and to call for a restraint on the tyranny of Presbyteries and other Church Courts; nay, in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and elsewhere, there were actually Scots, not stricken dead on the spot, but going about in apparently good health, who avowed themselves, or were declared by their neighbours to be, Independents, Brownists, Antinomians, Anabaptists, Familists, Seekers, and Antitrinitarians. There is no doubt that Scottish Presbytery was severely shaken by the English occupation which began in 1650-1, and that thence we may date most of that minute leaven of English forms of Puritan dissent still to be traced in Scottish society.[1]

---

[1] Carlyle's Cromwell, II. 252—275; Wood's Fasti, II. 159; Commons Journals of May 27; and Council Order Book, June 12 and 13, 1651.

In the Scotland of Charles II., north of the Firths, Presbyterian strictness had also been broken down, though from a different cause and in a different manner. Through January and February nothing had been more obvious than the continued readiness of the Committee of Estates, in their sittings with Charles at Perth or Stirling, to oblige him by allowing men of all sorts, Highlanders and Lowlanders, to rally to his banner. But the public proclamation of the policy in its full extent was reserved for the Parliament which met at Perth on the 13th of March (more precisely, in Scottish annals, "the Seventh Session of the Second Triennial Parliament"), and which, after sitting through the rest of that month, was adjourned for some weeks, but met again at Stirling for some days in the end of May. It was significant that at the opening of this Parliament Chancellor Loudoun was not elected President. In truth, Argyle, Loudoun,

---

[1] Chambers's Domestic Annals of Scotland, II. 202—213; Carlyle's Cromwell, II. 218—219.

Cassilis, Lothian, and the rest of that party, now found themselves in a minority. Still they remained in the Parliament, and thus, though they dissented from some of its Acts, made themselves responsible in part for the proceedings. "Friday, "21st March, *Rege præsente*, . . . the King and Parliament "repeals the forfaulting of umquhile Marquis of Huntley, and "restores his son, Lewis Gordon, to the honour, title, dignity, "and estate, of Marquis of Huntley," is a characteristic specimen of those proceedings; but the most characteristic, and indeed the conclusive one, was on May 30, 1651, when, after the matter had been referred to the Commission of the Kirk for their opinion, and that body had returned a timeserving answer, an Act was passed absolutely rescinding the famous Act of Classes. By this rescissory Act, the policy of the *Resolutioners* or *Coalitionists* was consummated in the lax and vague form to which Charles had desired from the first to see it stretched, and all Scotland north of the Firths was converted into a region nominally Presbyterian and Covenanted, but in fact promiscuously Royalist. Hamilton, Lauderdale, and the other Engagers of 1648, with old Montrose Malignants, heads of Highland clans, or whomsoever else, were now openly associated with Presbyterians of the *Resolutioner* species in the enterprise of retrieving for Charles II. the part of Scotland which had been seized by the English Commonwealth, and of recovering for him also the crown of England. In the midst of the general unanimity and exultation three classes of persons, it is true, found themselves more or less uncomfortable. Argyle and his partisans, pushed aside from their supremacy, and degraded once more into the mere "Campbell faction," can have had little pleasure now in surveying the results of their own handiwork. They had been heard in Parliament itself "checking the King much for his inconstancy in deserting his best friends, that brought him to this country, and put the crown on his head." Their regrets, however, had to be in the main secret. Having helped so much in the sowing, what could they do but abide the reaping? More openly discontented were such of the *Remonstrants*, *Protesters*, or *Anti-Resolutioners*, as were scattered, in stray particles, here a Guthrie, there an Andrew Cant or a Rutherford, through the northern shires. Public complaints and declarations from such men were not wanting, but how little effective they were appeared from the general acquiescence of even their fellow-Kirkmen in a recent sentence of the King and Committee of Estates ordering Mr. Guthrie, and his colleague in Stirling parish church, to remove from their charge in that town and confine themselves for a time to Perth or Dundee. It was pretty evident that, when the Kirk and the State should be at leisure, Mr. Guthrie and his adherents might expect punishment. A more extreme class of offenders, already subject to punishment wherever they were accessible, were Scots who had gone over to Cromwell, or were suspected of Cromwellian proclivities. Seven such, including the excommunicated Colonel Strachan, and the young Laird of Dundas, had been denounced by Parliament as traitors in their absence (March 24); and "On Friday, the 25th of "April," according to Balfour's memorandum, "Archibald "Hamilton, brother to Robert Hamilton of Milburn, for "giving daily intelligence to Oliver Cromwell and the Sec-"tarian enemy, was arraigned of high treason, and condemned "to be hanged on a gallows in chains, so long as one bone "could hang at another of him: which sentence was put to "execution this day at Stirling." By that time the levies that were to serve against Cromwell had been completed, and Charles's Army about Stirling and Perth, or elsewhere in Scotland north of the Firths, consisted of a good many thousands of men. Before June it was officered to his mind. Honorary Commander-in-Chief was the King himself, earnestly solicited to that post by the Parliament; but really Commander-in-Chief was Lieutenant-General David Leslie, with Lieutenant-General Middleton for his master of horse, Sir John Brown of Fordel and Thomas Dalyell of Binns for two of the Major-Generals, and other prominent military Scots, some of them Earls or Lords, and not a few of them old Royalists or Malignants, in command of brigades or regiments. A good deal was expected from the co-operation of the English Major-General Massey, already known to us in other circumstances, whose circuitous fates had lodged him in Scotland at this crisis, with Buckingham, Cleveland, Wilmot, Widdrington, and other Englishmen, all in quest of such new footing for their activity as the crisis might offer.[1]

In London and through England, as soon as it was known that Cromwell had recovered from his long illness, the expectation was that he would hurl himself against the King's Army of the Scottish north, and that there would soon be news of the crash. In this expectation people waited through the months of June and July, interesting themselves meanwhile in what was nearer at hand. Besides the return of St. John and Strickland from their unsuccessful embassy to the Netherlands, there were two topics of those months that helped to divert men's minds from Cromwell and the north.—One was the disgrace of Lord Howard of Escrick, so conspicuous as a Parliamentarian Peer since the beginning of the Civil War, and only last year a member of the Council of State. Rumours having reached Major-General Harrison that his Lordship, in his capacity as a member of Parliament and one of the Committee at Haberdashers' Hall, had been receiving bribes for excusing delinquents from sequestration, or making their compositions easy for them, and in particular that he had received a diamond hatband, worth £800, from one wealthy delinquent in Sussex, the resolute Republican had thought it his duty, as long ago as July 1650, to communicate the information to the House, that his Lordship might clear himself if he could. After strict inquiry, protracted through a year, it was found that his Lordship could not clear himself; and the House then did *its* duty by expelling him, and condemning him to the Tower and to a fine of £10,000. He received the sentence on his knees, June 25; and, though he was very soon released from the Tower, and his fine was not exacted, Lord Howard of Escrick lived on from that time a blasted man.[2]—Another topic of the same date was the case of the Rev. Christopher Love and his fellow-culprit Mr. John Gibbons. That the English Presbyterians, and especially the Presbyterian ministers of London and Lancashire, had been regarding with intense anxiety the course of affairs in Scotland, and praying for the success of Charles II. there, as the necessary preliminary to the subversion of the Commonwealth and the restoration of Royalty in England, was a fact known universally. Such mere sympathy with the enemy, mere prayers for his success, no Government could touch; but there had long been suspicions of correspondence. Let there only be proof of *that!* Now, by the accidental drifting into Ayr harbour of a small ship bound for the Earl of Derby in the Isle of Man, Cromwell had come into possession of most distinct proof of such correspondence, and indeed of a conspiracy of English Presbyterians and English Royalists generally in aid of Charles. In particular, a number of Presbyterian ministers, with Presbyterian ex-Colonels, ex-Mayors, ex-Chaplains, and others, had been holding meetings in London for many months past, and corresponding with Charles, his Scottish supporters, and the Queen-mother in France. The Council of State having been put on the track, and one of the conspirators having made discoveries to save himself, at least thirteen Presbyterian ministers of note had been found implicated, three of whom had been members of the Westminster Assembly: viz. Mr. Thomas Case, of St. Mary Magdalen, London; Mr. Christopher Love, formerly of St. Anne's, Aldersgate, but now of St. Lawrence-Jewry, London; and Mr. Richard Herrick, or Heyricke, of Manchester, one of the chiefs of the Lancashire Presbyterians, but of late resident in London.[1] These three, with most of the others, and some of their non-clerical associates, had been arrested; and seven of the whole number had been committed to the Tower by order of the Council of State (May 10), to take their trial "for high treason in keeping correspondency with the enemies of the Commonwealth and endeavouring to subvert the Government thereof." As usual, however, a selection was made of those deemed most guilty; and the clergyman Love and the layman Gibbons were the two selected,—Love because he had been especially active in the conspiracy and some of the meetings had been held in his house, and Gibbons because he too had been active and had once been a servant of Denzil Holles. Brought to trial before a special Court of High Treason; both were condemned to death, Love on July 5. The excitement in *his* behalf was immense among the Presbyterians. What! behead on a public scaffold one of the most eloquent and eminent preachers in London, only thirty-three years of age! His poor wife petitioned for him; his London brethren petitioned for him; there were many petitions for him. His case was much discussed in Parliament, where the struggle was between natural disposition to leniency and the feeling that it might be well to strike terror into the Presbyterian clergy by making an example, at such a moment, of a proved traitor in their body. Sir Henry Vane in particular was strongly of this opinion. In two divisions on the question of respiting Love for a month (July 11 and 15) he was one of the tellers against even that measure of mercy. By a majority of thirty-five to twenty-seven, however, it was carried on the second division that there should be a respite for Love to the 15th of August. There was a respite for Gibbons to the same day. Their ultimate fate depended much on the news that might meanwhile come from Scotland, and indeed on the view that Cromwell might take of their case. Accordingly, earnest appeals were sent to Cromwell in Scotland for his interference in Love's behalf. Not the least earnest was one from ex-Colonel Robert Hammond, governor of the Isle of Wight during the late King's captivity, Cromwell's peculiar affection for whom had survived their separation by Hammond's retirement from the service. "My Lord, when I had "the honour to know you well," Hammond writes, in a letter dated London July 22, "it was your Lordship's way in your "affairs, and sure it was the good way, the way of God, to "give a full summons before blood was shed;" and he goes on to implore Cromwell's intercession with Parliament for Love, as really a good man, however failing and however justly sentenced. On the other hand, Sir Henry Vane, writing to Cromwell about the same time, advises him not to intercede. He is daily confirmed in his opinion, he says, that Love and his brethren "do still retain their old leaven," and are disingenuously working on the weak side of the Government, so as to escape without any pledge to the Commonwealth, and at full liberty to treat it still as an unlawful magistracy; they are even calculating much, he adds, on Cromwell, and making sure that he will "cast in his influence" on the side of clemency, against "brother Heron [i. e. Vane himself], who is taken for a back friend to the Black Coats."[1]

---

[1] Balfour, IV. 241—307; with hints from Blair's Life, 260—271, and Baillie, III. 131—172.

[2] Commons Journals of July 30, 1650, June 25, 1651, and various intermediate dates, traceable in the Index; Ludlow's Memoirs, 334—336.

---

[1] See List of Westminster Assembly Divines, Vol. II. pp. 515—523; also Vol. III. p. 425 and p. 677.

It was easy for the Londoners to expect the news that Cromwell had hurled himself against Charles II. in Scotland and shivered Charles's Scottish Army to pieces. Hurling one Army against another is easier in expectation than in fact; and Cromwell, having David Leslie again opposed to him, had again had peculiar difficulties. Breaking up camp near Edinburgh on the 25th of June, he had marched northwestward in the direction of Stirling, and there had been manœuvering and skirmishing with Leslie's forces south of the town; but nothing could induce that general to quit the inexpugnable ground of moor and bogs where he had entrenched himself, barring the direct approach to the King's capital. Three weeks had passed, and Cromwell was still moving to and fro, south of the Firths, between Linlithgow and Glasgow, vainly attempting every device for a direct approach to Stirling by the dislodgment of Leslie. He and his officers, he tells us himself, were then greatly perplexed, and "did say one to another that they knew not what to do," when fortunately—"for indeed we know nothing but what God pleaseth to teach us"—the idea occurred of trying to cross the Firth of Forth into Fifeshire, and working through that county, by an east route on the King's flank, so as to come round upon him somehow in his central region at the back of Stirling. The idea proved most successful. On the 17th of July Colonel Overton, with some 2000 men, crossing the Firth in boats at Queensferry, managed to effect a landing at Inverkeithing on the Fifeshire coast, in spite of some opposition by the local Scottish forces; and, Major-General Lambert having crossed after him with additional troops, there was fought, on Sunday the 20th of July, what is remembered in those parts as "the Battle of Inverkeithing," in which Lambert beat a little army of five foot-regiments and four horse-regiments that had been sent round from Stirling, under the command of Major-General Sir John Brown, to save Fifeshire. About 2000 of the Scottish army were slain, and 600 taken prisoners, including Brown himself, who soon afterwards died of his wounds. After this victory of Lambert's, Cromwell, still on the south side of the Firth, hearing that the main Scottish army was marching from Stirling against Lambert in Fifeshire, made one more attempt to get at Stirling himself by the direct route, and went as near to it as Bannockburn; but, finding the enemy returned, and "at his old lock, lying in and near Stirling, where we cannot come to fight him, except he please, or we go upon too-too manifest hazards," he saw it best to keep to the Fifeshire opening and follow Lambert. Inchgarvie, a fortified island in the Firth, had surrendered on the 24th; and Cromwell, having sent over about 14,000 horse and foot, was himself in Fifeshire on the 28th. The surrender of the important town of Burntisland, July 29, made him master of the whole county.[1]

---

[1] Wood's Ath. III. 279 et seq.; Carlyle's Cromwell, II. 273—274; Council of State Order Book, May 10, 1651; Commons Journals, July 9, 11, 15; Neal's Puritans, IV. 44 et seq.; Halley's Lancashire and Its Puritanism, II. 12—16. For Hammond's Letters and Vane's see *Original Letters, &c., addressed to Oliver Cromwell,* edited by John Nickolls, Junr., 1743 (sometimes called "The Milton Letters," as they had been preserved by Milton), pp. 75—76 and p. 84.

At the time of Lambert's invasion of Fifeshire (July 17), it may be mentioned parenthetically, a General Assembly of the Scottish Kirk, with Mr. Robert Douglas for moderator, had been sitting at St. Andrews. The fiercest disputes had been going on in that body between the *Resolutioners*, who were greatly in the majority, and about twenty keen *Anti-Resolutioners*, led by Rutherford and Cant, who objected to the constitution of the Assembly and challenged its validity. The Battle of Inverkeithing, however, having convinced both parties that they must shift their dispute out of Fifeshire, the Assembly had been hurriedly adjourned by the majority, late on the Sunday night of battle (July 20), to the safe distance of Dundee. There, notwithstanding a protest by Rutherford and his adherents against the Assembly *in toto*, a certain number of the majority had met on Tuesday the 22nd, and had proceeded to the deposition of Messrs. James Guthrie, Patrick Gillespie, and another Anti-Resolutioner, and the censure of a few offenders besides. They had been at this amusement for three days when they were dispersed by the news of Cromwell's intended advance. Altogether, this General Assembly of St. Andrews and Dundee in 1651 (July 16–25) remained a mere thing of contempt in the annals of the Scottish Kirk.[1]

---

[1] Carlyle's Cromwell, II. 275—284; Balfour, IV. 313; Blair's Life, 276—277.

From Burntisland, still unable to get at Stirling immediately, Cromwell pushed due north, quite past and beyond the King, to Perth. His belief was that, if anything would open the lock round Stirling, it would be the capture of this more northerly town, and the consequent interruption of supplies to the King from the extensive Scottish north-east. He was at Perth on the 1st of August, and on Saturday the 2nd the town surrendered to him. It was a great success; but, at the very moment when it happened, there came news to Perth which quite altered the relevancy of the success to the rest of the war.—The King and his Council at Stirling had been discussing Cromwell's northward march and its probable consequences to themselves; and an idea, half desperate, and yet with a certain splendour in its audacity, had occurred to them. Cromwell now lying beyond them to the north, and the residue of his forces lying mainly in Fifeshire on the east, was not the way open for the King's Army, through the southern Scottish shires of Stirling, Lanark, and Dumfries, direct to Carlisle and England? Why remain at Stirling, always on the defensive, and probably to be crushed there sooner or later? Why not dare a bold march into England, displaying the King's standard in the territories of the Commonwealth itself, and welcoming the thousands and thousands of loyal Englishmen, especially Presbyterians, that would doubtless flock to that standard all along the march? Over this idea there had been an earnest and excited conference, Argyle alone of the chiefs dissuading from it, and refusing to accompany the expedition. Argyle, however, as they all knew, was no soldier; and, the King himself being eager, and the rest being eager or at least willing, the resolution had been taken. On the 31st of July, the King and David Leslie, with their main Army, had stolen from Stirling, as mysteriously as possible, for the first stage of their great southward march, leaving the defence of Stirling, the protection of the centre of Scotland, and indeed the conduct of the King's cause in Scotland generally, so far as there might yet be occasion, to the old Covenanting Generalissimo, the Earl of Leven, with the Earls of Crawford and Balcarras.—To Cromwell at Perth, on the 2nd of August, this news was a thunderclap. Never had he been more taken by surprise; people would soon be saying he had been outwitted! Was it actually an invasion of England that the Scots intended; and had he, never dreaming of such a thing, neglected precautions against it, and, by the removal of his own forces to the north of the Firth, left the way clear for them through the south of Scotland? For a moment he doubted the information; but, as it might be true, there was no time to be lost. Instantly a garrison was told off for Perth; instantly Lieutenant-General Monk was sent for, and to him, with 5000 or 6000 men left under his command, there was committed the entire charge of Scotland till Cromwell should reappear, with the business of reducing Stirling and doing whatever might be necessary against old Leven, Crawford, and Balcarras; and then, for every other English man, horse, gun, or waggon, the word was "Right about! Faces to the south again! double-quick march!" Between Saturday, August 2, and Monday, August 4, there was a whirl and tramp of the returning thousands of English Sectaries through the shires of Fife and Kinross, obliterating the Sabbath itself for the poor natives straggling gloomily to their parish churches. From Perth to Leith, in direct distance, as the crow flies, is thirty miles, and there is the Firth to cross at the last, an arm of the sea taking now some forty minutes by steamer. Yet Cromwell was in Leith on the 4th, with all his foot and most of his horse already across the Firth, and was writing a letter to Speaker Lenthall.[1]

---

[1] Blair's Life (Wodrow Society) 274—279; Acts of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland (1843) p. 220, footnote.

For a letter written in such circumstances it is singularly quiet. It explains briefly what had occurred, and the probability that now the war will have to be finished, not in Scotland, as people had hitherto supposed, but in England. It does not disguise Cromwell's knowledge that blame might be attached to himself on this account. "It may be sup- "posed," he says, "we might have kept the enemy from this "by interposing between him and England: which, truly, "I believe we might." The excuse is that he had been excessively anxious to avoid another winter's war in Scotland, and for this purpose had been doing his best, "in simplicity of heart as towards God," to obtain a decisive stroke at the enemy at Stirling, never imagining to what a desperate course they might be driven. As things were, England might be put for a time to great inconvenience; and it would be for the Parliament and the Council of State, with Major-General Harrison, in command of the English militia, to do all that could be done to give the enemy some check, "until we shall be able to reach up to him; which we trust "in the Lord we shall do our utmost endeavour in." Already Major-General Lambert, he says, has been despatched with a body of horse to hover in the enemy's rear; and he himself will follow very fast. Meanwhile Scotland may be considered perfectly safe under Lieutenant-General Monk. Through all the composure of the letter one perceives a certain private military delight in Cromwell's mind that, though not by his own choice, yet "by some kind of necessity," he was now relieved from the risk of meeting Leslie and the Scots in any prearranged lair of crag, hill, and bog, in their own very peculiar country, and might look forward to a plainer battle-field somewhere on English ground. Where was it to be? Preston was in his thoughts as he wrote the letter; but he probably foresaw that the battle-field now would be farther south.[1]

---

[1] Balfour, IV. 313—314; Carlyle's Cromwell, II. 484; Blair's Life, 379; Clarendon, 759—760.

Not for a month was it known where the battle-field was to be. What a month of excitement that was through England! On the 6th of August the Scots were at Carlisle; and thence they advanced, as Hamilton had done in his expedition of 1648, by the great road through Cumberland, Westmoreland, and Lancashire, passing at length the fatal Preston. It was ominous that so far there had been no such flocking of the English as had been expected to the King's standard. The King's proclamations had no effect; people saw the Army pass, but only gazed and wondered. Even the Presbyterians of Lancashire, from whom so much had been hoped, and among whom Massey's influence was supposed to be great, did not rise for the King or Massey. Was it that the severe procedure of the Commonwealth authorities against Love and his fellow-culprits had produced the intended effect; or was it that the Commonwealth was really more popular, on its own merits, among the Presbyterian laity, than had been thought? At all events, the only incident in the King's favour in Lancashire was the arrival of the Earl of Derby from the Isle of Man in obedience to a summons that had been sent him from Scotland. He met the King fervently, and was ready to live or die for his Majesty. It was thought best to leave this great nobleman, with Lord Widdrington and Sir Thomas Tildesley, to do what still could be done to stir up Lancashire and Cheshire; and so, having encountered no opposition as yet, save a slight one from Harrison and Lambert at the junction of these two counties, the King's Army moved on. Near Shrewsbury, when the garrison of that town would not surrender, it was determined that the resting-place and focus of farther operations, with a view to London, should be Worcester, a town of peculiarly favourable antecedents, and very suitably circumstanced at the moment. Accordingly, on Friday, the 22nd of August, the Army entered Worcester, about 20,000 strong, glad to be in such good quarters after their long and weary march. The King's standard was set up in the town, with new proclamation of his Royal titles. It may be doubted whether David Leslie was then any longer real Commander-in-Chief. For reasons known to himself, but quite imaginable, he had been growing visibly more grave and sad with every mile of the march farther and farther from the Scottish border. Massey and Middleton had been the more popular generals recently, and the greater favourites with the King. They were probably more in command than Leslie when the Army entered Worcester.[1]

---

[1] Cromwell's Letter in Carlyle, II. 284—286.

In London, all this while, both in Parliament and in the Council of State, there was great anxiety, great activity, and yet the most exemplary steadiness. There the King's invasion of England had sealed the fate of at least two of his adherents. Mr. Love and Mr. Gibbons had been again respited, and there is little doubt that, in ordinary circumstances, the sentence on them would never have been executed. In the actual circumstances, Parliament was rigorous as Draco; and on Aug. 22, the very day of the King's entry into Worcester, the two prisoners, amid the moans and tears of all Presbyterian London, were beheaded on Tower Hill. On the 24th of August, when the King's arrival at Worcester was known, there were two meetings of the Council of State, Sunday though it was, chiefly for militia orders and preparations. Presbyterian ministers of London and Lancashire were vigilantly watched, and arrests of more of them were contemplated. As regarded Lancashire, however, all fear was over on the 29th, when the news reached London that Colonel Robert Lilburne, who had been detached by Cromwell with a small band of horse and foot for the purpose, had fallen upon the Earl of Derby's force of some 1500 men at Wigan on the 25th, and had completely routed them, killing Lord Widdrington, Sir Thomas Tildesley, and many other officers, though the Earl himself had escaped, badly wounded, through Cheshire on his way to the King. Worcester then attracted all the interest, and what might happen there depended on Cromwell.[1]

---

[1] Clarendon, 760—762; Godwin, III. 264—268; Carlyle, II. 287—288.

Cromwell, who had trusted to Lambert and Harrison for their part in impeding the King's march, had been making all haste to come up with him, but had chosen the eastern route through York, Doncaster, and Nottingham. He was at Nottingham on the 22nd, the day of the King's entry into Worcester; and thence he bent towards the King by Coventry, Stratford-on-Avon, and Evesham. This last is about fifteen miles from Worcester, on the road between it and London; and here Cromwell rested for some preparations. Such militia reinforcements had poured in all along his route, or now came in, that he was at the head of an army of 30,000 men. With this army he was in sight of Worcester on the 28th; but several days had to be spent in securing and repairing a bridge over the Severn, arranging another bridge of boats, and otherwise hedging the town round to his satisfaction. In one of the preliminary skirmishings Massey was severely wounded. On Wednesday the 3rd of September, the anniversary of the Battle of Dunbar in the previous year, was fought the BATTLE OF WORCESTER, the last and greatest of Cromwell's battles, and known as his "crowning mercy." It lasted four or five hours, and ended in utter disaster to the Scots. About 3000 were killed, and 10,000 taken prisoners, with a loss of no more than about 200 men to the Commonwealth.

Among the prisoners, taken in the actual battle, or sooner or later in flight after it, were Leslie, Middleton, Massey, the Duke of Hamilton, the English Earls of Derby, Cleveland, and Shrewsbury, the Scottish Earls of Lauderdale, Rothes, Carnwath, and Kellie, and other Scottish lords and lairds past counting. The hardships of the poor Scottish prisoners of inferior rank, and of the fugitives that dispersed themselves through the English counties, were worse by far than those after Preston. Of the fugitives one of the most fortunate was to be Charles himself. What had become of him, however, was not yet known. Some hours after the battle he was one of a ruck of flying horse, which Leslie, who had also escaped so far, was trying to keep together, in hopes of forcing a retreat to Scotland. He rode with them till dark, but next morning he was gone. Thinking he would be safer by himself, he had stepped aside in the night with one or two attendants, and, after having made them cut off his hair, had parted from them also, and plunged alone into a wayside wood. How, by the advice of a Roman Catholic foot-captain, named Careless, whom he found already skulking there, he hid himself all next day aloft in a thick oak-tree, and what a walk he had next night with Careless over fields and ditches in his heavy boots, and how he passed the next two days and nights in the barn of a poor Roman Catholic peasant, who could bring him only bread and buttermilk for food, may be read, with a great deal more, in Clarendon. He had to tell the story himself afterwards, and for the present all trace of him was lost.[1]

---

[1] Council Order Books, Aug. 12—Sept. 1, 1651; Commons Journals, Aug. 16 and 22; Clarendon, 762—763.

Ill-starred indeed for Scotland was her connexion with Charles. The slaughter or captivity of some 14,000 of her sons by Worcester Battle was not all. Monk had been busy within Scotland since Cromwell's departure. On the 14th of August, Stirling Castle had surrendered to him after a three days' siege, yielding him not only 5000 stand of arms and forty cannon, but also the Scottish chair of state, royal robes, and public records, all of which were sent by sea to London. The news of this success had been received there before the Battle of Worcester; but two other successes of Monk, though they also preceded that battle, were not known till after it. Having laid siege to Dundee, and hearing that the remnant of the Scottish Committee of Estates, with some clergymen, were consulting at Alyth in Angus over means for the relief of the town, he had sent a detachment of horse and captured the whole company on the 28th of August; and on the 1st of

---

[1] Carlyle's Cromwell, II. 288—296; Clarendon, 764 et seq. There are discrepancies in the accounts of the escape of Charles from Worcester, and in the accounts of his conduct during the battle. See Bisset's *Commonwealth of England*, II. 195—201.

September he had taken Dundee by storm, with dreadful execution among the inhabitants for their resistance. Among Monk's prisoners by the two feats, shipped off by him for incarceration in England with their fellow-Scots from Worcester were the old Earl of Leven, the Earl of Crawford, Earl Marischal, Lord Ogilvy, some six or eight knights and lairds, and ten active ministers of the *Resolutioner* species, one of whom was Mr. Robert Douglas, moderator of the late General Assembly, and another, a certain Mr. James Sharp, minister of Crail in Fifeshire, to be yet farther heard of in Scottish history.[1]

Never since the Civil War began had there been such rejoicings and thanksgivings in London as there were over the Victory at Worcester. They began with bonfires and cannonades on the 4th and 5th of September, and they were not ended on the 24th of October, when Owen and Goodwin preached the great thanksgiving sermons. It was appointed, indeed, that there should be an anniversary commemoration of the victory for ever. And what applauses of Cromwell as the unique hero of the Commonwealth, the greatest man in England by long repute, and now by the proof of two more battles of the first magnitude fought and won since London had last seen his face! What would not the House do to show their gratitude? On the 6th of September it was voted, in recollection of his recent illness, that he should have Hampton Court for a country-residence, in addition to his town-residence of the Cockpit in Whitehall; and on the 11th it was resolved to settle additional lands on him and his to the value of £4000 a year, which, with the estate of £2500 a year formerly bestowed upon him, made a gift in all from the public of property worth £6500 a year (equal to about £23,000 a year now). Lands worth £2000 a year were at the same time voted to Ireton; while Lambert was to have £1000 a year in Scottish lands, Monk and Whalley £500 a year each, and Okey £300 a year, in the same kind of property. While these votes were being passed, a deputation from Parliament, headed by Whitlocke and St. John, was waiting on Cromwell in Buckinghamshire, to conduct him to London with sufficient state. On the 16th he was in his place in the House, receiving thanks through the Speaker; and on the same day there was a great city banquet in his honour.[1]

---

[1] Balfour's Annals, IV. 314—316; Blair's Life, 280—282; Commons Journals, Aug. 27 and Sept. 9.

Mingled with the question of rewards and honours for the victors was that of punishment for the vanquished. On the 11th of September, on the recommendation of the Council of State, the House named nine persons as "fit to be brought to trial and made examples of justice," i. e. to be tried capitally. Seven of these were English: viz. the Earl of Derby, the Earl of Cleveland, Major-General Massey, a Sir Timothy Featherstonehaugh, a Captain John Benbow, and the Mayor and Sheriff of Worcester; and the two Scots on the list were the Duke of Hamilton and the Earl of Lauderdale. Actually of the nine only three seem to have been brought to execution—the Earl of Derby, beheaded at Bolton, Lancashire, October 15; Benbow, shot at Shrewsbury that same day; and Featherstonehaugh, beheaded at Chester, October 22. The trials of the others having been deferred, there was the chance of mercy or of escape. The poor Duke of Hamilton, indeed, formerly known to us as Lanark, had been taken a prisoner with his thigh broken, and had died on the 12th of September, the day after he had been named for trial. Though the other most culpable Scot, Lauderdale, as they were conveying him to the Tower in a coach, had this comfortable salutation addressed to him by a London carman, "O my Lord, I protest, off goes your head, as round as a hoop," he remained in the Tower to the Restoration, with his big red head still on, and fit enough for farther mischief. The English Massey and the Scottish Middleton contrived, after a while, to escape to France. To none of the Scottish prisoners was greater respect shown than to the two military Leslies. Hardly had old Leven been in the Tower when, by Cromwell's motion, there were honourable relaxations of prison-rule in his favour, and arrangements which ended

---

[1] Council Order Books, Sept. 4 and subsequent dates; Commons Journals, Sept. 6, 9—11, 16; Whitlocke, Sept. 11 and 16.

(November 13) in his release on security, to live at Seaton Delaval in Northumberland, the mansion of one of his relatives. Without any such immediate release for David Leslie, there was every attention to his comfort, with free admission to the Tower for his wife and servants, and very soon (December 24) what was called "the liberty of the Tower" for himself. In the treatment of the other prisoners in the Tower, English or Scottish, there seems to have been a gradation; but one finds in the Council Order Books entries implying indulgences for the Earl of Rothes, the Earl Marischal, the Earl of Crawford, the Earl of Carnwath, the Earl of Kellie, Lord Ogilvy, &c. As Major-General Thomas Dalyell of Binns was, with Lauderdale, Middleton, and Rothes, to be of subsequent note in Scottish history, it may be mentioned that he was now, in his fifty-third year, so reduced in circumstances by fines and forfeitures that the Council had to allow him five shillings a week "for his subsistence during his imprisonment in the Tower." Only the chief prisoners were in the Tower; some of those of next rank were in custody at Windsor Castle, and others at Chelsea College. A good many of the subalterns had been got rid of by a resolution of the Council of State (Sept. 30) empowering a Committee to dismiss such of the captive Scottish officers as they thought fit, not above the rank of Captain, on security that they would go abroad. The chief embarrassment was with the thousands of common soldiers, herded together, on an allowance of 2*d.* and 2½*d.* a day, at Tothill Fields, London, or at Chester, and one knows not where besides. At first the idea seems to have been to export them as convict labourers to the West India plantations or the African coast; but, though some were so shipped off, and others were employed in the collieries and fen-draining works of England, the disposition gradually was to let all that remained go home. Many poor fellows, some of them College-students, did so return to their friends, to tell, in humble Scottish households, the story of Worcester Battle and of their hardships after it, and to infuse into the Scottish opinion of another generation their personal reflections on the Breda Treaty and on the fine policy of the Argyle Government and the Kirk-Resolutioners of 1650–1 on behalf of Charles II.

That young gentleman himself also got back safely to *his* friends. From the time of his disappearance after Worcester Battle there had been something of a hue and cry after him, with a proclamation (September 9) of a reward of £1000 for his apprehension; and there was a subsequent order of the Council of State (October 13) for vigilance at all the ports to prevent his escape. Nevertheless, it was probably a relief to the Authorities of the Commonwealth to know that they were not to have the responsibility of deciding what to do with him. After some weeks of wandering in disguise, and of shelter in faithful Royalist families, he had emerged on the Sussex coast at "a little fisher-town" called Brighthelmstone, now Brighton, and he and Wilmot had embarked there for Normandy. Buckingham, after similar wanderings, was equally successful in reaching the Continent. Letters from Paris of the 28th of October announced that the King had arrived in that city on the 19th, had been immediately met by his mother, and had been engaged ever since in telling to her and others the story of his adventures, making them laugh much at the most comical passages. He was very scurrilous and reproachful, it was said, in his way of talking of the Scots and the English Presbyterians, and was making it clear that, if ever he did try his fortunes again in Great Britain, it should not be under the auspices of that section of his subjects.[1]

There can hardly have been a more wretched man in Britain at this crisis than the Marquis of Argyle. Having disapproved of the expedition into England and declined to accompany it, he had retired to his castle of Inverary to await the result; and here, borne in woful Gaelic up or across Loch Fyne, the fatal news had reached him. No news that could have reached him would have been other than fatal to himself. Had Charles triumphed, what footing in Scotland could have remained for Argyle? As it was, his own annihilation had come with his country's ruin. And this was the end of all his astuteness, all his prayerful Calvinistic statesmanship, all his recent effort to weld into union the two interests which he really did care about, his own and Scotland's, and that third interest of the Stuart succession which had no root whatever in his private beliefs. Could it possibly have been different? In an age when England had her Cromwell, could Scotland, by any change of method, have been tided through, successfully or respectably, with Argyle for her chief statesman? With a little less of astuteness, and a little more of magnanimity, one thinks that Argyle might have sufficed. No Scottish noble of the time had moments of deeper or shrewder insight, or had formed a cooler and less prejudiced estimate of the proportions of Scotland, or of what Scotland could represent, in the affairs of the British Islands. But then the moments remained moments, mere sagacious perceptions in Argyle's mind, never translated, as they ought to have been, into a bold, active, and continuous policy. The difficulties of such a translation would, doubtless, have been enormous. Scotland had been overrun and overmastered by a most zealous, most conscientious, but most unreasonable clergy, not one of whom since the death of Henderson had the brain of a real leader; and the best part of the population had been worked into a fever of national and Presbyterian self-conceit, passing the bounds of sanity. What chance of inducing such a country to accept a policy of Presbyterianism for itself, with some toleration of Dissent, and a neighbourly neutrality at least towards the struggle of Independency and other forms of Dissent with Presbytery in England? Nevertheless, this, which one can discern to have been Argyle's latent intention, and which was all that England wanted from Scotland, is what Argyle ought publicly to have tried. Had he tried it early enough, who knows but that, with his ability, and his great hereditary power in Scotland, he might have succeeded? Then, but for his notorious deficiency in personal courage and in military talent, the most natural arrangement, and probably the best altogether, would have been that, some time between 1643 and 1647, he should have become the Presbyterian King of Presbyterian Scotland, and should, in that capacity, have managed the relations of Scotland to England through the rest of the Civil War. Or, but for the same defect, what was to have hindered Scotland, after the death of Charles, from then crowning Argyle, if she still wanted monarchical government, or from making him the President of a Scottish Presbyterian Republic, in contact with the English Republic, if that would have suited her ideas? In either case Argyle would have been in a position consistent with his real principles, and Scotland might have behaved rationally. Having failed, however, through defect of genius and of valour, to prepare Scotland for this use of himself, he had wrenched his conscience at last to preserve his power. And so it had been his task for two years to convert a swarthy-faced and good-humoured young scapegrace into a covenanted King of Great Britain and Ireland, himself becoming Duke of Argyle in the process, with a guarantee of the recovery of £40,000 he had lost, and with other pleasant prospects besides. That he might persevere in this task, he had parted company with his old friend and colleague Warriston, and had classed himself with the easy Resolutioners, while Warriston went with the troublesome Remonstrants. True, other Counsellors having divided his influence with Charles, he had recoiled at the end, when just in sight of the catastrophe. But was it right for him to have recoiled just then? Better surely to have been among the dead from Worcester Battle, like poor Hamilton, or a caged prisoner in the Tower, with David Leslie, Lauderdale, and the rest, than to be now pacing by the shore of Loch Fyne, the unhurt Marquis of Argyle, with Gaelic gillies crouching at his nod, but with all Scotland wailing to the east of him, and mixing his name with their curses.

---

[1] Council Order Books and Commons Journals of several dates given; Parl. Hist. III. 1375; Clarendon, 766—722; Bisset's *Commonwealth of England,* II. 201—215 (where there are interesting particulars about the disposal of the Scottish prisoners).

"Mourn, hapless Caledonia, mourn
Thy banished peace, thy laurels torn."

Argyle made one attempt, even in this extremity, to reinsert himself into British politics. There is extant a brief letter of his, dated "Inverary, 15th October, 1651," and addressed to Monk as the representative of the English Commonwealth in Scotland. "I know the truth of Solo-"mon's saying, that in the multitude of words there wants "not sin:" so the letter begins, in excuse for coming to the point at once. "I desire to know from you, as one having "chief trust in this kingdom," is then the pith of the letter, "if it were not fit that some men who have deserved trust in "both kingdoms may meet, to good purpose, in some con-"venient place, as a means to stop the shedding of more "Christian blood, which has a loud cry in the Lord's ears "against the unjust authors or contrivers of it." In other words, Argyle wanted to know whether there would still be liberty for himself, and others who had blundered in the same fashion, to do their best now to repair their blunder by meeting and proposing terms of submission to the Commonwealth. "This letter," says the annalist Balfour, "was sent "with a trumpeter to Dundee; who arrived there on Sunday "the 19th of October, and received from Lieut.-General "Monk only this answer: That he could not treat without "orders from the Parliament of England."[1]

The Parliament of England had by that time resolved on a mode of dealing with Scotland which did not require farther negotiation with Argyle or any one else. Terrified by Monk's severe treatment of Dundee, the cities of St. Andrews and Aberdeen had hastened to surrender; other places and districts had followed; and, though there was still a handful of Scots in arms in the north under Lord Balcarras, the dispersion of these, and the reduction of all Scotland, even to the Orkneys and the Shetlands, would be, it was foreseen, but the easy work of a month or two for Colonels Lilburne, Okey, and Overton. It was resolved, therefore, to take no half-measures, such as had been contemplated after the first news of the fall of Dundee, but to incorporate Scotland wholly with the English Commonwealth. As it was expressed, more kindly and delicately, in the Declaration on the subject adopted by Parliament on the recommendation of the Council of State (October 23–28), it was resolved that Scotland should and might be incorporated into and become one Commonwealth with England, whereby the same government which was enjoyed by the good people of the English nation, without King or House of Lords, might be derived and communicated to the Scots. That the incorporation might be effected with due local knowledge, and with all regard for the feelings of the natives, or at least of such of them as it might be right to conciliate, the business was to be matured in Scotland itself by eight Commissioners, acting and consulting there under secret instructions: viz. Lieutenant-General Monk, Major-General Lambert, Major-General Dean, Lord Chief Justice St. John, Sir Henry Vane, Colonel George Fenwick, Mr. Richard Salway, and Alderman Robert Tichbourne. The Commissioners were appointed October 23; and Lambert and Dean at once went to Scotland, to join Monk there, and prepare the country for the arrival of the other five.[1]

---

[1] Balfour's Annals, IV. 316—317.

A glance at Ireland is proper at this point. Ireton, left there in May 1650 as Lord-Lieutenant Deputy for Cromwell, had continued his father-in-law's rule with great ability, industry, and perseverance. Before the close of 1650, Carlow in Leinster, and Waterford, Duncannon, and Nenagh in Munster, had been taken, and there had been other such successes under Ireton himself and his officers, or under Sir Charles Coote in Ulster, that the Marquis of Ormond had seen it fit to go abroad (Dec. 1650), leaving the Marquis of Clanrickarde as his substitute in the Lord-Lieutenancy for King Charles. Through the year 1651, Ireton having been in the meantime joined by Ludlow as his Lieutenant-General, there had been farther successes of these two, and of Coote and Lord Broghill, against Clanrickarde, Lord Castlehaven, and Lord Muskerry, on the Irish side, culminating in the capture of Limerick after a long and desperate siege (Oct. 27). This last success, demolishing as it did nearly all that remained of resistance in Ireland, was heard of with great joy by the English Parliament, and was accounted an incident of importance in the history of that year, even after such vaster events as the Battle of Worcester and the Conquest of Scotland. Already, as we have seen, in the distribution of rewards to the chief heroes of the Commonwealth after Worcester, Ireton's great services in Ireland, both military and civil, had been handsomely remembered. If the relative values of the estates then voted to him, Cromwell, Lambert, Monk, and Whalley, are of any significance, Ireton's deserts on the whole at that date were rated as next to Cromwell's, and as twice Lambert's, and four times Monk's. Ludlow says that, when Ireton received the intelligence of the vote of £2000 a year to him, he declared he would not accept it, and would have been better pleased if he had seen the Parliament less liberal in its votes of rewards to its servants from the public treasury, and more bent upon general economy.[1]

---

[1] Commons Journals, Oct. 23 and 28, 1651; Godwin, III. 309—310.

Two matters of fact, both belonging to October 1651, may be noticed together, as illustrating, though in different ways, the exaltation of mood in the Government of the Commonwealth after the victory of Worcester.—One was the immediate discharge of the Presbyterian ministers and others that had been arrested in May as fellow-conspirators with Love and Gibbons. On the 4th of October Mr. Heyricke of Manchester, the ringleader of Lancashire Presbyterianism, took the Engagement and was released. Other London and Lancashire Presbyterians in custody had their liberty on the same easy terms; and on the 15th of October nine of the conspirators, who had actually been tried and condemned after Love (including Mr. Thomas Case and other London ministers, Dr. Drake, a physician, Colonel Joseph Vaughan, and Captain Hugh Massey, brother of Major-General Massey), received a full and free pardon by grace of the Parliament. Now that the Commonwealth was secure, now that the poor men themselves were conscious of their mistake, and willing to live peaceably for the future, what use in taking their lives or in keeping them from their families and occupations?—While magnanimous clemency was thus the rule at home, the attitude to foreign powers was that of haughtiness or even of defiance. The United Provinces of the Netherlands were the first to feel this. Their refusal of the federation offered by the Embassy of St. John and Strickland had not been forgotten. St. John himself had been revolving in his dark and deep mind some effective and yet just means of retaliation, and the result had been a piece of legislation very famous in English History under the name of "The First Navigation Act." Brought into Parliament by Whitlocke from the Council of State on the 5th of August as "A Bill for the Increase of Shipping and Encouragement of Navigation," it had passed through all the usual stages, and became law on the 9th of October, when it was ordered to be proclaimed at the London Exchange and in all ports. Substantially its provisions were that no colonial produce should be brought into England except in ships of English or colonial ownership, and no goods or produce from any European country except in English ships or ships of the particular country where the commodities had grown or had been manufactured. Criticising this act (which, with modifications, was to govern English commerce for nearly two centuries), Adam Smith, in his *Wealth of Nations*, while admitting that it was in direct conflict with his great principle of Free Trade, yet concludes that, in the circumstances in which it was passed, and for the purposes contemplated, it was "perhaps the wisest of all the "commercial regulations of England." At all events, it struck consternation into the Dutch. It threatened ruin to their carrying-trade, the great source of their wealth. Accordingly, their High Mightinesses much regretted now their treatment of the late English Embassy, and remembered St. John's parting words. They at once sent a letter to the English Parliament (received Oct. 15), and they prepared to send Ambassadors Extraordinary to renew the interrupted Treaty, and, if possible, recover lost favour.—Not in the United Provinces alone, however, had the news of the Battle of Worcester resounded with effect. In every court of Europe deference to the powerful Islanders and their prosperous Republic was now seen to be expedient.[1]

---

[1] Godwin, III. 281—286 ; Commons Journals, Nov. 28, 1651 ; Ludlow's Memoirs, p. 371 and p. 375.

Scotland virtually annexed, Ireland subdued, English disaffection crushed and people of all classes settling down in acquiescence at last, the whole foreign world compelled to respect and to some degree of admiration: here, surely, was a goodly array of results achieved by the Government of the Commonwealth before the end of the third year of its existence. What other three years of English History can show a more solid or brilliant set of performances? Why, then, does the British memory revert so little and so reluctantly to those particular years? Because they were the beginning of the so-called "Interregnum," that period of mainly Republican management which English scholarship and the lazy general mind, saturated as they are with the Clarendonian tradition, have agreed to regard as historically unrespectable. This will cure itself in time. The years 1649, 1650, and 1651, are not years of English History of which any Englishman need be altogether ashamed, or about which he can afford to remain ignorant.

The Parliament and the Council of State at the close of 1651 were not ashamed of the performances of those three years, but very well satisfied. They had one uneasiness, however. It lay in the consciousness of the entirely anomalous character of the Government which they jointly constituted. The Council of State, nominally of forty-one persons, but effectively of from ten to twenty at each sitting, was but the creation of the Parliament; and this Parliament was but the small surviving fragment of a Parliament, originally 500 strong, dating its commission from the English People from as far back as 1640. All the great actions of 1651 had been ordered or directed, and their costs sanctioned and imposed, by a House the attendance in which still ranged, very much as in previous years, from thirty-six to sixty-five, averaging about fifty.[2] This could not go on for ever. For nearly three years there had been discussed, but never with any real result, the question of the time for dissolving such a makeshift for a Parliament and electing a new Representative House of 400 members, on some such basis as that Draft *Agreement of the People* by Ireton which still remained the published theory of a right constitution for the English Commonwealth. Was the question again to be adjourned, or was it to be faced before the third year was out? On the one hand, there was the old argument that the existing Government, however anomalous, had answered remarkably well. Though small, it was a survival of the fittest. On the other hand, it was argued that pledges, considerations of theory, and public expectations, must go for something, and that it would be the greatest of blunders to wait till public opinion was enraged. It might have been argued also, and indeed was argued, that the existing Parliament had been a fighting Parliament, and that the exigencies of English politics that now lay ahead were of a different kind from those for which it had proved its fitness. The harmonious reunion of all classes of English society; the termination of the system of Sequestrations for Delinquency and of the harassing machinery of Committees, &c., that had been necessary to work that system; the review of the acts for a Presbyterian Church-Establishment; the whole question of the proper organization of a Preaching Ministry; the included question of the extent to which good and pious men of the old Church of England persuasion, hitherto outcast, might be welcomed back, and admitted into the National Preaching Ministry, with some indulgence for their more innocent peculiarities; the questions of University extension and of the Reformation of Schools; the much needed Reform of English Law and of English Law-Courts: did not all these, and much miscellaneous business besides, lie in that more quiet future to which, after the hard fighting of the last three years, the Commonwealth might now look forward? For these problems of peace the existing fragment of a Parliament was obviously insufficient. Recognising this, let it fix some period for its own dissolution, and close its illustrious career honourably by arrangements for the election of its successor.

---

[1] Council Order Books, Oct. 4, and Commons Journals of other days named; Godwin, III. 381—384; *Wealth of Nations*, Book IV. Chap. 2.

[2] Divisions in the Commons Journals from Feb. 1650—1 to the end of October, 1651.

The Army, it seems, was of this latter way of thinking. Now, as the Army had made the Republic, as the so-called Commonwealth was fundamentally a Stratocracy, this fact came to be of great importance after the Battle of Worcester. But, again, the Army, now more than ever, was preeminently Cromwell. What *he* thought the Army had come to think; and what the Army thought *he* singly could express. When, therefore, on the 16th of September, Cromwell reappeared in the House, twice-laurelled as the first of Englishmen since his last brief appearance there fifteen months before, and when, that very day, after the extraordinary applauses and thanks rendered to him, he moved the question of a new Representative, it was clear to the House, whatever were its own dispositions, that the question could no longer be evaded. "That "the House do, tomorrow morning, take into debate concerning "an equal Representative in Parliament, the first business, "nothing to intervene," was the Resolution that day. Next day, accordingly, there was the debate, with an adjournment to that day week for a Report from the Grand Committee of the House of what had already at various times been done on the subject; and, such Report having been duly made and debated, the result appeared (Sept. 25), thus: "The question "being propounded that a Bill be brought in for setting a "time certain for the sitting of this Parliament, and for "calling a new Parliament, with such rules, qualifications, "proportions, and other circumstances, as this Parliament "shall think fit, and shall be for the good and safety of this "Commonwealth, the House divided. The *Yeas* went forth: "(Lord General, Mr. Scott, Tellers for the *Yeas*) with the *Yeas* "thirty-three; (Sir Henry Mildmay, Sir James Harrington, "Tellers for the *Noes*) with the *Noes* twenty-six." In other words, in a House of fifty-nine, Cromwell carried his motion by a majority of seven. A Committee, including Cromwell, Vane, Marten, St. John, and Whitlocke, having been appointed to prepare the Bill, it was read the first time Oct. 8; on the 10th the House went into Grand Committee on it; and, after thirteen sittings in Grand Committee, the House was asked to debate, as the most immediate question, "Whether "it be *now* a convenient time to declare a certain time for the "continuance of this Parliament, beyond which it shall not "sit." On Nov. 14, after discussion, there were two divisions on this question, the affirmative being carried in both—on the previous question by fifty to forty-six, and on the main question by forty-nine to forty-seven. In both divisions the tellers for the majority were Cromwell and St. John, and for the minority Colonel Morley and Mr. Bond. The attendance of a House of as many as ninety-six on the occasion, the maximum attendance in the whole year previously having been sixty-five, proves the interest taken in the question; and the closeness of the divisions is also significant. It was probably this closeness of the divisions that induced Cromwell to be content with his victory so far, and not press another division on the question of the particular date that should be fixed for the dissolution. "*Resolved*, that the time for the continuance "of this Parliament, beyond which they resolve not to sit, "shall be the 3rd of November 1654," was the unanimous agreement on this subject Nov. 18. The House had given themselves a long lease, but it was something gained that the country could look forward with certainty to a new Parliament at the end of three years more of this one.[1]

The day after this Resolution, the Council of State having reported to the House that, by the arrangement made for this year of the Commonwealth, their power was to expire on the 1st of December, the House entered on the business of the election of a new Council. On the 24th of November, 120 members being present in the House, one and twenty members of the existing Council were re-elected by ballot, confirmed by open resolution in each case. Cromwell was at the top of the poll with 118 votes (a unanimous vote, for, though 120 members were present, only 118 voting papers were given in); Whitlocke came next, with 113; St. John next, with 108; Vane next with 104; and so down to Mr. Carew and Mr. Love, the lowest of the twenty-one, who had sixty votes each. The ballot for the twenty new members was taken the same day; but the result was not declared till next day, when it was found that Colonel Morley came first of the twenty with ninety votes, and Henry Marten last with forty-one. Of these twenty, ten had sat in one or more of the preceding Councils, and ten were quite new men. Among these was Robert Blake. The proceedings in the election of the new Council were closed on Nov. 26 by a very remarkable regulation, which occasioned three divisions. The regulation, as ultimately carried by forty-four votes against forty-two, was that in future no one should be President of the Council of State, or of any Committee of Parliament, for more than one month. Possibly Cromwell's hand may be discerned here too. Bradshaw had been President of the Council of State for three years, and his permanent Presidency, or any permanent Presidency, may have seemed undesirable. It is to be remembered, however, that Bradshaw himself had, at the beginning of the previous year, desired to be relieved from the Presidency.[1]

---

[1] Commons Journals of days named.

---

[1] Commons Journals of dates given; Milton's *Cromwell Letters,* p. 65, where there is a letter of Feb. 18, 1650—1, from Bradshaw to Cromwell, then in Scotland, in which he says, "We are now beginning with a new Council another year. I might have hoped, either for love or something else, to have been spared from the chair; but I could not obtain that favour."

CHAPTER VI.

MILTON'S LIFE AND SECRETARYSHIP FROM FEB. 1650–51 TO DEC. 1651.

PUBLICATION OF MILTON'S *PRO POPULO ANGLICANO DEFENSIO CONTRA SALMASIUM*: EXTRACTS ABOUT MILTON FROM THE COUNCIL ORDER BOOKS: PROPOSAL TO REMOVE HIM FROM HIS WHITEHALL LODGINGS: INTERFERENCE OF THE COUNCIL: SENSATION CAUSED BY THE *PRO POPULO ANGLICANO DEFENSIO* ON THE CONTINENT: ITS RECEPTION AT STOCKHOLM BY SALMASIUS AND QUEEN CHRISTINA: GOSSIP ABOUT SALMASIUS AND MILTON FROM THE VOSSIUS-HEINSIUS CORRESPONDENCE: RUMOUR OF A FORTHCOMING REPLY BY SALMASIUS TO THE *DEFENSIO*: VOTE OF THANKS TO MILTON BY THE COUNCIL: EXTRACTS FROM THE COUNCIL ORDER BOOKS CONTINUED: TWO OF MILTON'S LATIN STATE LETTERS (NOS. XVIII. AND XIX.): MILTON'S CENSORSHIP OR SUPERINTENDING EDITORSHIP OF THE *MERCURIUS POLITICUS,* AND HIS CONNEXION WITH MARCHAMONT NEEDHAM: ACCOUNT OF THE *MERCURIUS POLITICUS,* WITH SPECIMENS OF ITS ARTICLES: LEADING ARTICLE ON THE BATTLE OF WORCESTER: BIRTH OF MILTON'S THIRD CHILD, A SON: MRS. POWELL AND MILTON: PROGRESS OF HER SUIT: CONTINUED FAME OF MILTON'S *DEFENSIO*: MORE GOSSIP FROM THE VOSSIUS-HEINSIUS CORRESPONDENCE: SALMASIUS CRESTFALLEN AT CHRISTINA'S COURT: HIS RETURN TO LEYDEN: NO APPEARANCE OF HIS REPLY TO MILTON: ANONYMOUS SUBSTITUTE

FOR IT IN A *PRO REGE ET POPULO ANGLICANO APOLOGIA*: ACCOUNT OF THE BOOK: *EIKON AKLASTOS*, AN ANONYMOUS REPLY TO THE *EIKONOKLASTES*: MILTON'S EUROPEAN CELEBRITY: CHRISTOPHER ARNOLD'S VISIT TO LONDON: HIS GOSSIP ABOUT MILTON AND OTHER LONDONERS.

ON all grounds, the event of Milton's life this year which deserves precedence is the actual publication of his Answer to Salmasius. "*Joannis Miltoni Angli pro Populo Anglicano Defensio, contra Claudii Anonymi, alias Salmasii, Defensionem Regiam: Cum Indice. Londini, Typis Dugardianis, Anno Domini* 1651" ("Defence of John Milton, Englishman, for the People of England, against the Royal Defence of Claudius the Nameless, alias Salmasius: with an Index. London: from Dugard's Press: 1651"):—such was the title of the book, a neatly printed duodecimo of 260 pages of text, besides the Index. My belief is that copies were out in March, and probably before the 25th of that month, when people in England ceased to write "1650" and began to write "1651." The reasons are subjoined in a note; and, as the range of uncertainty is at the utmost over a week or two, it will be enough to recollect that the publication was an event of the very beginning of the third year of Milton's Secretaryship.[1] Although the book had been registered as forthcoming both in Latin and English, it appeared only in Latin.

Leaving the book to circulate for a few weeks, making its own impression, we may pass to the Order Books of the Council of State for the routine incidents of Milton's Secretaryship in the early months of this third year of the Commonwealth.

---

[1] In the Thomason copy in the British Museum the date "Aprill 6th" is written on the title-page; whence it is to be inferred that the particular copy came into Thomason's hands on that day. But in the same copy the figure 1 in the date 1651 is deleted, and "1650" inserted as the year. As it is impossible that "April 6" and "1650" should go together in this case, I infer that the intention was to note that, though this particular copy came to hand on April 6, 1651, there had been copies out at least a fortnight before: i.e. *within* the year then called 1650. I have not seen a copy with the printed date 1650; but in Bohn's Lowndes that date is given for the earliest issue. The book reached Stockholm, we shall find, April 11, 1651 (Swedish dating); whence it seems impossible that it should not have been out in London earlier than April 6, the date of Thomason's copy. Was there a large demand for the book; did the issue extend through February, March, and April; and were the earliest copies without the Index?

Wednesday, Feb. 19, 1650–1 (i. e. first meeting of Council for the year):—*Inter alia,* Ordered, "That MR. JOHN MILTON be "Secretary for the Foreign Languages for the time of the Council." As it was ordered the same day that no servant of the Council, except the General Secretary, Mr. Frost, and his son, the Assistant Secretary, should be present at any of the debates of the Council without special order, I infer that Milton's attendance had by this time begun to be only occasional.

Wednesday, March 5:—*Present:* Bradshaw, Lemon, Armyn, Colonel Thompson, Mr. Challoner, Hasilrig, Sir John Trevor, Lord Grey of Groby, Purefoy, Say, Darley, Love, Mildmay, Walton, Mr. Attorney General Prideaux, Vane, Bond, Masham, Major Lister, Cawley:—"That it be referred to the Committee of Examinations "to view over MR. MILTON'S book, and give order for reprinting of "it as they think fit; and that they also examine the complaint by "him made about Peter Cole his printing a copy concerning the "Rickets, which Mr. Dugard allegeth to be his."—It has been supposed (Todd's Milton, ed. 1852. I. 87, note, and Hamilton's *Milton Papers,* p. 27) that the first part of this entry concerned Milton's *Eikonoklastes,* and signalised the desire of the Council to bring out a reprint, or revised edition, of that work. My belief is, however, that "Mr. Milton's book" here referred to is not the *Eikonoklastes* (the second and enlarged edition of which, with 1650 as the date of publication, we have already left behind us), but the *Defensio pro Populo Anglicano contra Salmasium.* That work, as I interpret, had already, in its first state, passed through Dugard's press; and the Council had ascertained that the demand for it was likely to be such that Dugard had better go to press again. This is confirmed by the fact that, while the earliest issue of copies bears date 1650, most copies bear date 1651; and it might be farther confirmed by an examination of copies of both dates, to see whether they differ in anything else besides having or not having the Index. Also it is to be noted that, while the first edition was in duodecimo, to match the popular edition of Salmasius's book, editions in other sizes, and one in folio, described as "*auctior et augustâ formâ*" followed in the course of 1651, to match the finer editions of Salmasius. All this the Council may have had in view in the authority now given to the Committee of Examinations.—The second part of the entry, so oddly connected with the first, is easily explained. Mr. Dugard, who was then printing Milton's Answer to Salmasius, and seeing him every other day, had asked Milton to mention to the Council that another London printer, Peter Cole, was infringing a copyright of his by printing a popular medical book. Milton obliges Dugard, and the matter is referred to the Committee of Examinations.

Thursday, March 27, 1651:—*Present:* Bradshaw, Fielder, Salway, Armyn, Say, Darley, Walton, Lister, Thompson, Love:—"That the "letters that are to be sent to the Ambassador of Spain shall be "sent unto him by Mr. Milton." Milton, as we know, was much occupied about this time as interpreter and go-between in the negotiations both with the Spanish Ambassador Cardenas and the Portuguese Envoy Guimaraes. One of the particular letters mentioned in this minute (if there was more than one) was probably a long letter of the same date, March 27, 1651, which will be found in Thurloe, I. 175–6, entitled "Council of State to the Spanish Ambassador." It is in English, and complains of outrages on English subjects at Malaga. If this is the letter mentioned, Milton had not written it: he was merely to convey it to Cardenas, and perhaps explain its purport.

Friday, March 28:—"That Mr. Milton do translate the *Inter-"cursus Magnus* which he is to have from Sir Henry Vane." The Council wanted a translation for some purpose connected with the Embassy of St. John and Strickland to the United Provinces. The Ambassadors were then at the Hague beginning their negotiations.

Friday, April 4:—"That such dispatches as come to this Council "from foreign parts in any foreign tongue are to be translated for "the use of the Council." This implies work for Milton.

Thursday, April 10:—*Present:* Bradshaw, Say, Gurdon, Scott, Lord Grey, Whitlocke, Walton, Bond, Darley, Bourchier, Pickering, Prideaux, Goodwin, Lieut.-General Fleetwood, Skippon, Mildmay, Love, Trevor, Lisle, Vane, Thompson, Alderman Allen, Carew:—"That Mr. Vaux be sent unto to let him know that he is to for-"bear the removing of Mr. Milton out of his lodgings in White-"hall, until Sir H. Mildmay and Sir Gilbert Pickering shall have "spoken with that Committee concerning that business."—Lodgings in Whitehall, as we know, were a very valuable perquisite of the chief men of the Commonwealth, and were in great demand. The matter had been one of much difficulty, arising from the preoccupation of portions of Whitehall by army-officers and soldiers; and there had been many orders of Council for removing such persons, and securing the whole of Whitehall for strictly official use. The matter had assumed so much consequence that on the 14th of February of this year Parliament had appointed a Committee of twenty-six persons, of whom five were to be a quorum, under the name of *The Committee for Whitehall,* "to consider of accomoda-"tions of lodgings for members of the Parliament in Whitehall, "and for removing all unnecessary persons out of Whitehall, and to "consider of accommodating the soldiers now in Whitehall in other "convenient quarters" (Commons Journals, Feb. 14, 1650–1). Six members of the present Council of State were also members of this Committee; but, as there were twenty additional members, it was quite possible for the Whitehall Committee to come to some conclusion which might interfere with the convenience of the Council of State. One of the Committee, it is worth remarking, was that Sir John Hippesley, M.P. for Cockermouth, whose former apartments in Whitehall were now occupied by Milton (ante p. 150). Whether by some action of Hippesley, or by action of the Committee as such, there was now, it appears, an intention of treating Milton as one of the "unnecessary persons" in Whitehall and removing him from those apartments. At all events, Mr. George Vaux, the Housekeeper of Whitehall, had signified as much to Milton and given him notice to quit. It was likely to be a great inconvenience to Milton; and, the matter having been reported to the Council, they interfere, in the Secretary's behalf, as above.

Friday, May 16, 1651:—"That Mr. Milton do repair to the "Public Minister of Portugal and desire of him from the Council "a list of the names of such persons as he desires to carry with him "as his retinue, that the same may be affixed to his pass." This may have been Milton's last interview with Guimaraes, or the last but one; and the errand was a disagreeable one. That very day (ante p. 275) the Parliament had broken off the Treaty with Portugal, and ordered intimation to be sent to Guimaraes that his farther stay in England was quite unnecessary.

Tuesday, May 20:—"That Mr. Durie do proceed to the trans-"lating of Mr. Milton's book written in answer to the late King's "book, and that it be left to Mr. Frost to give him such reward for "his pains as he shall think fit."—Might not the *Eikonoklastes* be useful abroad? Why not have a French translation of it, especially as Mr. Durie, whom the Council had recently appointed Librarian at St. James's (ante p. 229), was willing to undertake the task? The translation, we shall find, appeared in due time, but not this year.

Friday, May 30:—"That Mr. Milton do translate the petition "of Alderman Dethicke and the Letters of the Council to the "Spanish Ambassador into Latin, that the same may be sent to the "said Ambassador, according to the former order." Dethicke was an important London merchant, of whom we shall hear again.

Wednesday, June 11:—*Present:* Bradshaw, Darley, Bourchier, Bond, Lister, Masham, Hasilrig, Scott, Trevor, Harrington, Fielder, Vane, Thompson, Lord Grey, Skippon, Fleetwood, Pickering, Challoner, Brereton, Love, Lemon, Salway:—"That Lieutenant-General "Fleetwood, Sir John Trevor, Mr. Alderman Allen, and Mr. Chal-"loner, or any two of them, be appointed a Committee to go from "this Council to the Committee of Parliament for Whitehall, to "acquaint them with the case of Mr. Milton, in regard of their "positive order for his speedy remove out of his lodgings in White-"hall, and to endeavour with them that the said Mr. Milton may "be continued where he is, in regard of the employment which he "is in to this Council, which necessitates him to reside near the "Council."—The former application, of April 10, to the Committee for Whitehall, it would appear, had not been successful. Indeed that Committee had meanwhile armed themselves with a new order from the House itself, which involved Mr. Milton's case, as well as others. "Resolved by the Parliament" is a record in the Commons Journals of May 9, 1651, "that the Committee of White- "hall do accommodate members of Parliament with lodgings in "Whitehall, the Mews, and Somerset House, with the best con- "veniences those places will afford respectively; and to put forth "such other persons and families as they shall think fit." This order was not spontaneous on the part of the House, but was obtained on a report from the Whitehall Committee itself, brought in by Mr. Augustin Garland, M.P. for Queensborough (one of the Regicides). Mr. Milton, most certainly, was one of those that must be turned out! The Council of State, it will be seen, did all they possibly could. They appointed a very influential Committee, with General Fleetwood on it, to remonstrate with Mr. Garland and his fellow Committee-men. There is no precise record of the result, but it appears to have been satisfactory. The Latin Secretary was allowed to remain in Whitehall, but with a feeling on his own part, after what had happened, that it might be better to be looking out for a house of his own somewhere in the neighbourhood.

Were the Committee for Whitehall aware what they were doing? Why, all Europe was beginning to ring with the name of this Mr. Milton. Nothing he had yet done had carried his name so far, or roused such an interest in him beyond the bounds of England, as his *Pro Populo Anglicano Defensio* in reply to Salmasius. He had been well, and even largely, known within England by his previous writings, though his reputation on account of them varied, according to the quarters in which he was criticised, from that of an exquisite English poet and most scholarly and magnanimous prose-writer, to that of a monstrous heretic, a blasphemer of Bishops, a Republican and defender of the Regicide, whose English style was as bizarre, bombastic, and execrable as his opinions were abominable; but never before had he stood on the vantage-ground of a subject commanding the immediate attention of foreigners as well as of Englishmen. This he had done in his reply to Salmasius. He spoke in that book authoritatively, as the man selected by the Government of the English Commonwealth to defend it before the bar of Europe; he had written it in Latin, that it might be read at once abroad; and he had entitled it *Joannis Miltoni Angli pro Populo Anglicano Defensio.* Wherever on the Continent the book reached, an opinion could not but be formed of this hitherto unknown "John Milton, Englishman," who addressed them as from the battlements of the British Island; these opinions could not but express themselves speedily in one way or another; and the rumour of them, coming into England, could not but mingle there with the notions of Milton already entertained by his countrymen. Now, as it happened, the sensation produced by the book abroad had been enormous.

"Milton's book came here yesterday," writes Isaac Vossius from Stockholm, April 12, 1651, to his friend Nicolas Heinsius, then back in his native Leyden. "The Queen begged "my copy from me. I have but run through it hastily yet. "I had expected nothing of such quality from an English-"man; and truly, if I am not mistaken, it has also pleased, "with only one exception, our incomparable Lady Mistress. "Salmasius, however, declares that he will send the author, "with the whole Parliament, to perdition." In his next letter to Heinsius, dated April 19, Vossius returns to the subject. "We received last week," he says, "Milton's "Apology for his Parliament. Our incomparable Lady "Mistress read the book, and, if I am not mistaken, was "greatly pleased with it. Certainly, in the presence of "many, she spoke highly of the genius of the man, and his "manner of writing. Salmasius is already girding himself "for an answer, though he is not yet recovered from his "long illness; but anger will supply him with strength and "weapons enough." Before receiving these letters, Heinsius himself at Leyden had been busy over the volume. "I trust "Milton's virulent book has long ere this time reached you," he writes to Vossius, May 8: "we have seen five different "forms of it here, and they say a Dutch version and a French "are now in preparation." Just a week later (May 15) Heinsius, having meanwhile had the news from Stockholm in Vossius's letters and in others, hands it on, with great glee, to his friend John Frederick Gronovius at Deventer. "Vossius was ordered," he writes, "to put Milton's book, as "soon as it was brought to the Court, before Salmasius;

"which, by my faith, he must have done unwillingly. I "wish my good friend Wullenius, who gives me this intel"ligence, had also informed me with what face Salmasius "took it . . . Salmasius [Vossius himself now informs me], "after receiving Milton's book, stormed and fumed, and "threatened to send the author and the whole Parliament to "perdition. But the trouble and labour of replying will, "I believe, somewhat check these first impulses." Three days afterwards (May 18), replying to Vossius, Heinsius writes more at large thus: "I marvel that only one copy of "Milton's book has reached Stockholm, as I know that three "were sent at one and the same time. The book is in every"body's hands here on account of the nobility of the matter, "and we have seen already four editions, besides the English "one—to wit, one in quarto, published at Gouda; three in "duodecimo, of which the first is published by Ludovic "Elzevir, the second by John Jansen, and the third by some "one at Utrecht: moreover a fifth edition, as Elzevir tells "me, is being hurried through the press at the Hague. I "see also a Dutch translation hawked about, and they say a "French one is expected. Who Milton himself is people are "not very well agreed. I have seen some who assert that "he is of very low birth, but learned, and promoted to the "highest dignity by the popular faction. Ludovic Elzevir, "on the contrary, declares that he has the best evidence that "he is a man both of high birth and of wealth, unconnected "with State offices or business, and living independently on "his country estate. He wrote an English refutation of the "*Eikon Basilike*, which is in the highest esteem among the "Parliamentarians. He has also published some Latin "Poems; but they have not yet come into my hands. If "I learn anything more certain, I will take care to com"municate it to you." On the 4th of June, Vossius, while Heinsius's last is but on its way to Stockholm, writes to him: "My best thanks for letting Gronovius know what I wrote "to you. You will also oblige me very much by telling me "farther who and what sort of man this Milton is. Be so "good as to send me his *Eikonoklastes*, if you have it." On the 11th he again writes, in reply apparently to a letter of Heinsius not preserved: "Salmasius is wholly occupied in "ruminating a work against Milton. That is amusing news "of yours about Graswinkel: he will come badly off if he "touches Milton." Graswinkel was a Dutch publicist of celebrity, living at the Hague: he is mentioned again in the next letter of Vossius to Heinsius, dated June 18. "I am "sorry to hear," he says, "that Gronovius is in bad health. "But Graswinkel is in worse health if he is going to oppose "himself to that English mastiff—I mean Milton. I thought "there was an intimate familiarity between you and Graswinkel: but truly you do not seem to study his interests "much; for, if you did, you would neither encourage nor "allow his project. The King of Scotland, if he is wise, "will at any price impose silence upon him; but the Parliamentarians ought to forward his undertaking, and even "offer to pay him handsomely for it . . Salmasius is now "engrossed in the idea of confuting Milton's writing, and "means to return abuse for abuse, and not to let himself be "beaten by a smaller man even in that department." Just two more extracts from this learned correspondence, though they carry us a few days beyond the exact date we have reached in our narrative.—On the 20th of June, Heinsius, who had meanwhile left Leyden for a short visit to Amsterdam, wrote from that town to Gronovius at Deventer thus: "Salmasius is all alert for drubbing Milton, whom he openly "represents as suborned and instigated by me, and he "threatens on this account much mischief to me and my "father [Daniel Heinsius, still alive at Leyden, at the age "of seventy-one] in the Apology which he is preparing, and "in which he is to be down upon all three of us together. "Truly, the man's madness is wonderful, but it shall not pass "with impunity. I have seen a wild letter of his, which "portends something dreadful for our reputation." Again, on the 1st of July, 1651, Heinsius, still at Amsterdam, wrote to the same Gronovius: "They say that Scribonius Largus "[a nickname for Salmasius in the Heinsian circle] has now "put to the press at Stockholm a ferocious attack on the

"English Commonwealth. That wretched old gentleman is "raving mad. He has sent two letters lately to this city, "not deficient in sycophantic spite, in which he threatens to "turn all his venom against me, because he understands I "think well of Milton's book. But what I have said, and "will still say, is not so much that a bad cause has been "well pleaded by Milton as that Scribonius has pleaded most "abominably the cause of the unfortunate King. If he "cannot endure this frankness of mine, let him be hanged! "There is no reason why he should expect me to take the "post of his flatterer; for he cannot but know that he has "never hitherto found me his servile and obsequious client. "But it is a malignant and Salmasian fiction of his that I am "not less the enemy of Kings than Milton is, inasmuch as I "have twice publicly testified what I think of the English "Parricide. If Mr. Salmasius gives me the chance, as beyond all doubt he will, you shall see him shortly set forth "and trimmed according to his deserts in his proper company, i. e. among the *Regicides*. I will not spare either his "old age or his bad health. I will treat him as he long ago "treated my father, or worse, if I can . . . Salmasius's attack "on Milton is now in course of publication. Our Graswinkel "also has undertaken to defend the cause of Kings against "the same Milton, and wants the book to be printed at "Elzevir's press."—It will be seen that the great Salmasius was not regarded as a Prophet by all Dutchmen, and that the Heinsii, in particular, were at feud with him.[1]

In France and Germany, no less than in Holland and Sweden, the attention of scholars had at once been fastened on Milton's book; and he himself tells us (*Def. Sec.*) that it had hardly been out when positively every foreigner then resident in London, as ambassador, envoy, or agent, for any foreign prince or State, either called on him purposely to congratulate him, or took the opportunity of a casual meeting to do so.

---

[1] The extracts in this paragraph are translated from the letters of Isaac Vossius and Nicolas Heinsius given in Peter Burmann's great collection, in five quarto volumes, published at Leyden in 1727 and entitled *Sylloge Epistolarum a Viris Illustribus Scriptarum.* See, for the originals in their order, Vol. III. of that work at the following pages :—595, 596, 600, 257—9, 603, 605, 606, 607, 267, 270. The information in the letter of Heinsius of May 18, 1651, as to the immediate foreign reprints of Milton's *Defensio*, has, I think, escaped bibliographers. About Heinsius in a certain connexion with Milton long ago see Vol. I. pp. 721—722. Though they had never met, both counted the Florentine Carlo Dati among their friends and correspondents.

Even, therefore, had the members of the Council of State, and the Londoners generally, been asleep themselves as to the importance of Mr. Milton's service to the Commonwealth by his last book, the reverberation of it from abroad, and the talk about it among foreigners in London, must necessarily have roused them. There is no reason to doubt, however, that the book had found eager and enthusiastic readers among all English adherents of the Commonwealth to whom the Latin was no bar, and that there were men in the Council of State who had perceived from the first that it was a book of which the Commonwealth might be proud. It had been out, at all events, just about three months, when the Council of State thought fit to take formal and ceremonious notice of it. And here we resume our extracts from the Order Books:—

Wednesday, June 18.—*Present:* Bradshaw, Harrington, Brereton, Bourchier, Skippon, Trevor, Love, Lemon, Darley, Bond, Masham, Salway, Lord Grey, Say, Pickering, Gurdon, Fleetwood, Mildmay, Thompson, Goodwin, Cawley:—At this meeting there was an express testimony of the Council's gratitude to their Latin Secretary for his *Defensio pro Populo Anglicano.* In the Rough or Scroll Order Book it is entered in this fashion:—(1) There is a *cancelled* entry, the greater part of which, having been only cross-scored gently by the pen, is perfectly legible, but the last two lines and a half of which are so carefully obliterated as to be all but wholly undecipherable. Having done my best to make out the obliterated words, I quote the whole entry, giving my imperfect reading of the dubious part in Italics: "That thanks be given to "MR. MILTON, on the behalf of the Commonwealth, for his good "service done in writing an answer to the Book of Salmasius, "written against the proceedings of the Commonwealth of Engl.: "*And it is ordered that ye sum of . . . hundred pounds be given to* "*him as reward from this Council for his . . . . Salmasius.*"[1] (2) There is this subsequent minute, intended to stand instead of the cancelled one: "The Council, taking notice of the many good "services performed by MR. JOHN MILTON, their Secretary for "Foreign Languages, to this State and Commonwealth, particularly "of his Book in vindication of the Parliament and People of Eng-"land against the calumnies and invectives of Salmasius, have "thought fit to declare their resentment and good acceptance of "the same, and that the thanks of the Council be returned to "MR. MILTON, and their sense represented in that behalf."—There is but one possible interpretation of this passage in the Council Order Book. The Council, in Milton's absence, first voted him their thanks and a sum of money; but, before the meeting was over, it was intimated to the Council, either by Milton in person or by message from him, that he would not accept any money reward, and so the Council changed their minute, voting him their thanks only, but doing so more comprehensively and emphatically. Apart from Milton's natural magnanimity, it was utterly impossible that he should accept a money-reward for his book, after what he had said about Salmasius and his hundred Jacobuses.

---

[1] Mr. Douglas Hamilton, of the State Paper Office, who has necessarily had the best opportunities of being sure of the correct reading, fills in the first of the two spaces I have dotted with the word, "*one,*" and the second with the words, "*good service done in writing in answer to.*" (Milton Papers, p. 26). Very probably he is right; but, as I could not assure myself what number the obliterated word in the first space stood for, I have kept my own jagged reading. What the words in the second space were is of no consequence; but one would like to be sure of the numerical word in the first space.

Saturday, June 21:—Mr. Vaux, the Housekeeper of Whitehall, had been giving trouble; for this day the Council ordered the door opening out of his lodging in Whitehall into the street to be walled up, and himself to be informed that he was not to intermeddle with any business above-stairs in Whitehall on any pretence whatsoever. Was the Council more severe to Mr. Vaux on account of his recent conduct to Mr. Milton?

Monday, June 23:—"That Colonel Fielder be desired to ac-"quaint MR. CARYL that the Council hath thought fit to call him "to succeed Mr. Owen in the work of the Ministry at Whitehall; "and Mr. Caryl is to have the same allowance for his pains therein "that Mr. Owen had, and the Committee for Whitehall are to be "spoken unto to appoint some rooms in Whitehall for his accom-"modation." Caryl and Owen, it may be remembered, had gone, in September 1650, on a mission to Scotland by Cromwell's desire, and Hugh Peters had been appointed to officiate as joint Chaplain with Sterry to the Council till Owen's return (ante p. 229). Owen meantime having been appointed Dean of Christ Church, Oxford (March 1651), the Council now make CARYL the permanent joint-Chaplain with STERRY. Milton's attack on Caryl in his *Colasterion*, the last of his Divorce Tracts, in 1645, can hardly have been forgotten either by himself or by Caryl (Vol. III. pp. 314–315); but they had of late had opportunities of meeting about the Council, and may have made up the little difference. Rooms in Whitehall, we see, were to be provided, if possible, for Caryl, though Milton had been troubled about his.

It is rather remarkable that through the remaining five months of the third year of the Commonwealth (July — Nov. 1651) there should be scarcely a mention of Milton in the Order Books of the Council. It was the time of Cromwell's vigorous resumption of the war in Scotland after his illness, of the excitement in London over the case of Christopher Love, of the unexpected invasion of England by Charles II. and his Scottish army, of Cromwell's pursuit of him and the extraordinary exertions of the Parliament and Council of State in cooperation with Cromwell, and of the Battle of Worcester and its heart-stirring effects. That Milton's services in the foreign secretariate should not have been greatly in request through such a time of domestic commotion is not surprising; but the unusual rarity of traces of his presence at the Council through so long a period does not seem to be wholly explained by that single cause. One suspects illness for some part of the time, and remembers his rapidly failing eyesight. He was certainly still in London, as we shall find, and still performing, in his Whitehall lodgings, odds and ends of official work. Here meanwhile are the only minutes of Council during those five months that seem to appertain in any way to his biography. In only one of them is he mentioned by name:—

Wednesday, July 2:—On information that there are weekly issues of scandalous pamphlets in London and Westminster under pretence of intelligence, Colonel John Barkstead, the Council's officer, is charged with the duty of seeing that such are seized, and their authors and vendors brought to account. This is one of several entries proving increased strictness with the press in consequence of Love's conspiracy and other signs of Presbyterian complicity with the Scots.

Friday, September 5 (two days after Worcester Battle):—Mr. Frost, secretary to the Council, instructed to use all his respites of time in compiling "a narrative and history of the Proceedings betwixt England and Scotland from the beginning of the late troubles." One might have expected Milton's name here.

Monday, October 17:—"That Mr. Milton do inform himself "from Mr. White what he intends by his proposition to the "Council mentioning a second impression of his late book with "some additionals, and acquaint the Council with his judgment con-"cerning the thing. That £50 be paid by Mr. Frost to Mr. White "in consideration of his pains in writing the treatise of the Life "and Reign of the late King." Is this *The Life and Reigne of King Charles I., or the Pseudo-Martyr Discovered,* an octavo published anonymously, Jan. 29, 1650–1?

Altogether the Order Books for the greater part of the political year 1651 do not present us with a large amount of strictly official work done by Milton. We have to turn, however, to his *Letters of State* in quest of any addition in the form of Latin dispatches to Foreign Powers. That also is very small.

(XVIII.) To THE SENATE OF HAMBURG, *March* 12, 1650–1 [1] :—This is again a complaint to the Hamburgers of their insufficient protection of English merchants. It is not long, it says, since the Parliament of the Commonwealth sent Richard Bradshaw, Esq., to Hamburg, to represent English interests and demand justice for certain outrages on English subjects, especially for an attempt to murder the Preacher of the English Merchant Company in Hamburg (i. e. some one holding the office that had been held from 1622 to 1628 by Milton's tutor, Thomas Young), and the forcible kidnapping for a time of some eminent members of the Company. Nothing satisfactory had been done in that matter; and now there are rumours of new violences, particularly by a certain Garmes, who has brought English merchants before public courts in contempt of their privileges. To all this the Senate is entreated to pay attention. The letter is sealed with the Parliament seal and signed by the Speaker.

(XIX.) To PHILIP IV., KING OF SPAIN, *Aug.* 10, 1651 [2] :—This is also a letter of complaint. Notwithstanding the recent commercial treaty with Spain, English merchants are much troubled and damaged by tributes imposed upon them by his Spanish Majesty's governors and other officers at various ports, and particularly in the Canary Islands. These things are done, doubtless, without his Majesty's knowledge; but he must look into them, or the Treaty will be in danger. Compensation is especially expected for the injuries done by Don Pedro de Carillo de Guzman. It is suggested to his Majesty that the restoration of a Judge-Conservatorship in behalf of the merchants would be a good expedient.

An extremely curious fact in the history of Milton's Secretaryship, not hitherto known, is that through the whole of this year 1651 he acted as an official Licenser or Censor of the Press. That the author of the *Areopagitica* should be found in such a capacity is certainly a surprise. The evidence, however, is incontestable, nor is the explanation difficult.

Bradshaw's new Press Act of September 20, 1649, will not have been forgotten. Nor will it have been forgotten that, under this Act, the duty of licensing Newspapers and Political

---

[1] Given in the Printed Collection and in Phillips, but not in the Skinner Transcript.

[2] No. 14 in Skinner Transcript, which supplies the exact date.

Pamphlets had been assigned by Parliament to Mr. Henry Scobell, the Clerk of the Parliament, Mr. John Rushworth, the Army-Secretary, and any third person the Council of State might appoint—which third person turned out to be Mr. Gualter Frost, their General Secretary. Since the passing of the Act, accordingly, these three persons had been licensing all news-pamphlets appearing legally. Each of the three, however, seems to have attached himself to one newspaper in particular, the numbers of which he licensed successively, and of which therefore he may be said to have had a kind of editorial supervision. Scobell's more peculiar charge was the weekly journal called "*Several Proceedings in Parliament*," begun Oct. 9, 1649, and published on Tuesdays; Rushworth's was "*A Perfect Diurnall of some Passages of the Armies*," begun Dec. 27, 1649, and published on Thursdays; and Frost's, as we know, was "*A Briefe Relation of Some Affairs and Transactions*," begun, Oct. 1, 1649, and published on Mondays by Matthew Simmons. Milton, though he was often employed to report on papers or pamphlets after they were published, had not hitherto been charged with any such newspaper censorship or editorship; but a fourth editor had been found for the Commonwealth in Milton's friend Marchamont Needham, formerly the notorious *Mercurius Pragmaticus* for the Royalists, but since June 13, 1650, the equally popular *Mercurius Politicus*, writing weekly for the existing powers and subsidized by them (ante pp. 226–7). What we have now to report is that, after Needham had gone on with the *Mercurius Politicus* for eight months, Milton was associated with him as his censor, licenser, or supervising editor. The proof is found in the Registers of the Stationers' Company of London. "March 17, 1650–1: "Tho. Newcome entered for his copie, by order of MR. MILTON, "six Pamphletts, called *Mercurius Politicus*," is an entry in these Registers, with the sum of "3*s*." appended, noting that Newcome had paid the registration fee of 6*d*. a copy for each of the six copies of the journal so registered. But this is not all. Again on the 17th of April Newcome enters five copies of the *Mercurius Politicus* (all that had appeared since the last entry) "under the hand of MR. MILTON," and pays

2*s*. 6*d*.; again on May 22 there is an entry of four copies as licensed by MR. MILTON; on the 29th of the same month one number is registered by itself by the same authority; and thenceforward, regularly, week after week, to the end of the year, each successive number of the *Mercurius Politicus* is registered as it appears, always under the hand of MR. MILTON. Once, in fact, viz. on the 6th of October, "Mr. Griffin and Mr. Leach entered for their copy under the hand of MR. MILTON a pamphlet called *The Perfect Diurnall*"; the meaning of which is that on this occasion Rushworth was out of the way, and Milton did licensing duty for Rushworth's paper also. In the main, however, throughout the year, it is of the *Mercurius Politicus* that Milton has charge, Rushworth, Scobell, and Frost, attending to their own papers respectively, and doing other licensing work. Thus on the 9th of September Frost licenses a pamphlet containing a narrative of the case of Christopher Love, with "animadversions" thereon.[1]

There can be no doubt, I think, that the peculiar addition to Milton's secretarial work involved in the superintendence of the *Mercurius Politicus* was the result of some distinct, though unminuted, order or request of the Council of State of the third year of the Commonwealth. He began the duty within the first month of that year, just when he was free from the labour of seeing his *Defensio pro Populo Anglicano* through Dugard's press; and he continued to perform it regularly through those later months of the year, from June to December, in which, as we have seen, he had little else to do for the Council. One can imagine, through those months, Needham's weekly visits to the invalid Milton in his Whitehall apartments, bringing the proofs of each forthcoming number of *Mercurius* with him, and their consultations over the articles, and Milton's occasional criticisms and perhaps suggestions and improvements. For, though nominally a censorship of the Press, the business was in reality only such a friendly superintendence of the witty Needham, in his subsidized editorship of the *Mercurius*, as Milton might easily reconcile to his principles. How far the superintendence passed actually into a kind of conjoint editorship must, I believe, be left to conjecture; but, as Milton's connexion with Needham is a fact of some interest in his biography, some further account of the *Mercurius Politicus* and its contents during the period of Milton's censorship of it may be appropriate here.[1]

---

[1] My own MS. Notes from the Stationers' Registers are my authority for statements in this paragraph; but the dates of the first numbers of *Several Proceedings* and *A Perfect Diurnall* are from Nichols's Literary Anecdotes, IV. 48.

"*Mercurius Politicus: comprising the summ of all Intelligence, with the Affairs, and Designs now on foot, in the three nations of England, Ireland, and Scotland. In Defence of the Commonwealth and for Information of the People*": such is the title of the first number of Needham's journal, published Thursday, June 13, 1650, with the motto from Horace "*Ita vertere seria ludo.*" It consists of sixteen pages of small quarto, and this continued to be the size. The printer or publisher for the first few numbers was "Robert White"; but in the eighth number he gives place to "Matthew Simmons," who announces subsequent numbers as "published by command of authority." In January 1651, however, Simmons was succeeded by "Thomas Newcomb," who was the responsible publisher when Milton's censorship began.

The first number is all Needham's, and is in his most characteristic style. Its leading article opens thus:—"Why should "not the Commonwealth have a fool as well as the King had? "'Tis a point of State; and, if the old Court humours should "return in this new form, 'twere the ready road to prefer-"ment and a lady's chamber. But you'll say I am out of "fashion, because I make neither rimes nor faces for fiddler's "pay, like the Royal *Mercuries;* yet you shall know I have "authority enough to create a fashion of my own and make "all the world to follow the humour." The article then goes on to ridicule Charles II., nicknamed "Young Tarquin," and his expected arrival among the Scots, with allusions to the recent execution of Montrose and an account of Cromwell's return from Ireland. No. 2, published June 20, is much in the same vein. "Alas! poor *Pol.*," the leading article begins, "how the parrots begin to prattle. 'Tis the talk of the town "who and what this *Politicus* is. Those things called the fine "gentlemen say he is a witty fellow, because they do not "understand him; yet they buy him, that he may be pro-"duced as a compliment to their mistresses when they are "pumpt to a nonplus. The ladies themselves, they'll have "him too, because 'tis a bauble of their fool's commending. "The Cavaliers like him, because he writes true English, and "gives them good counsel about the Scots: only they shake "their heads a little at the name of Young Tarquin. Take "heed of that rock, for as sure as you are alive 'twill split all "your fortunes. But as for the Presbyters, they cry out that "*Politicus* is an Atheist, because he tosses the Kirk like a "football, and jerks their hypocrisy. O ye publican Sectaries "and harlots, come ye not near them, for these are the congre-"gation of Dathan and Abiram, who stand upon holy ground, "and are more holy than you, if you list to believe them." Succeeding numbers are still in the same vein of coarse drollery, Young Tarquin always the nickname for Charles, while the Duke of York is called sometimes James Tarquin. About the fifteenth number, however (Sept. 12–19), I note the introduction of a graver and more serious style into the leading articles. The main theme of that number is the recent Battle of Dunbar; and, referring to the chagrin of the London Presbyterian ministers over that defeat of the Scots, the leading article has this passage:—"One of them in his "Lecture devotion, contemplating the fatal rout of his Scotch "familiars, sent forth this short ejaculation: 'Lord, if thou "'dealest thus with Covenant-keepers, what wilt thou do with "'Covenant-breakers?' But will they never cease these "juggling insinuations? Is there no way to prosecute the "Covenant but upon a Scottish accompt? Alas! such prating "companions are but as so many parish-clerks, bound to say "after the priests of the General Assembly, and sworn never "to swerve from the sense or nonsense of that canting frater-

---

[1] What follows is the result of my own examination of all the successive numbers of the *Mercurius Politicus*, week by week, from its commencement in June 1650 to the end of 1651. I have to thank the authorities of the British Museum for their courtesy in affording facilities for the examination.

"nity." In subsequent numbers I observe a steady increase of this graver vein in the leaders, with a rarer occurrence, though not a total cessation, in the minor paragraphs, of the gross and indecent phrases with which Needham was apt to season his drollery. In especial, I note, before the end of the year, the commencement of a series of articles forming a continuous popular treatise on the Theory of Politics from the Republican or anti-Royalist point of view. They follow each other almost regularly at weekly intervals, each beginning at the point where the last left off, and each containing the reasoned exposition of some proposition about law and government. Thus, in No. 21 (Oct. 24–31) the leader begins, "Whereas it is objected farther in particular that our present "governors have no call or consent from the people, it's "answered," &c. These instalments of a connected political treatise now supersede, in fact, the jocose leaders on passing events with which Needham had started his journal.

Milton's censorship of *Mercurius Politicus* is not known to have begun before January 1650–1, but it was in full force from that month onwards. His connexion with the paper through the whole of 1651 may be the cause of occasional mentions of him and his book against Salmasius in the correspondence and news-paragraphs. Thus, in No. 33 (Jan. 16–23, 1650–1) readers are informed that "a very victorious Reply to Salmasius is now in motion at the press"; which piece of news a correspondent from the Hague acknowledges in No. 37 (Feb. 13–20) thus: "I am thankfully glad of the "promise *Politicus* gives us of Salmasius' answer, which we "greedily expect; and Salmasius himself seems to desire it, "Goliah-like despising all his adversaries as so many pigmies." Again in No. 39 (Feb. 27—March 6) a professed Dutch correspondent from Leyden says, "We hear in our Academy, "and I was told it at the Hague also, that your Ambassadors "[St. John and Strickland] will bring with them the Answer "to Salmasius. I perceive by him, though he dreads no "antagonist, that he could wish it [i. e. his own book] to "write again, for it was never calculated for this change, as "is since fallen out." As Salmasius was then at Stockholm, and not in Leyden, one may suspect the authenticity of this communication. The next mention of him, however, is correct enough. "I hear Salmasius is not like to live "to make any reply to Milton's book, which here is very "much applauded," writes a correspondent from the Hague in No. 43 (March 27—April 3): "It seems he is very ill "in Sweden; that air doth not agree with his body." Finally, in a letter from Paris in No. 56 (June 27—July 3), we have this passage: "Mr. Milton's book hath been burnt "at Toulouse by an *arrest* of that Parliament; but the said "Parliament, as you know, is under the government of the "Duke of Orleans, whose affections are well known to you."

That character of increased gravity and dignity which *Needham's Journal* had begun to assume before the end of 1650 is amply sustained through the year of Milton's censorship. It was then, indeed, a very creditable paper, and indubitably the most effective popular organ of the Commonwealth. As before, the contents of each number consisted of an introductory editorial article or leader and of a miscellany of gossip or intelligence, generally in the form of extracts from letters, from English provincial towns, from Scotland, from Ireland, and from the chief continental capitals — the letters from Edinburgh, in particular, very frequent so long as Cromwell was in Scotland. The remarkable series of leaders setting forth connectedly a theory of Republican politics was still continued. A specimen or two of their style may be given. "I am often in contemplation," says the leader of No. 43 (March 27—April 3) "of a "memorable example recorded in the second Book of Samuel, "Chap. IV.; and that is of Ishbosheth, the son of King Saul, "who, laying claim to the kingdom after his father by pre-"rogative of succession, made war against David, who was "placed in the government according to God's appointment. "But, to show that hereditary succession is no plea to justify "a war against the powers ordained by Him, He placed "marks of displeasure against all that took part with Ish-"bosheth, so that, he being heir of the curses of his family, "his fortune declining, and all his designs proving success-

"less, and himself a burden to his party, he in the end had "his head strook off by some of his own ambassadors and "brought to David. Now, when God hath opened the eyes of "the Scots so far as to consider that they have an Ishbosheth "among them," &c. Again, in No. 65 (Aug. 28—Sept. 4), where the writer is engaged in a survey of the reigns of the English Kings, giving "their true portraictures after the copy "of our English chronicles," in order to prove "how little reason we have to be in love with Kings," he passes on from a somewhat admiring sketch of Elizabeth to "James the Scot, "brought in with and for a plague to the nation; the whole "design of whose reign was to undermine the liberties of "England. He laid the main plot of Tyranny; and then, "being sent (as his son Henry was) into another world, he "left his son Charles to execute it." Again, in No. 67 (Sept. 11–18), "The first war may be truly named *Bellum* "*Episcopale,* the Bishops' War, as being made for upholding "the two correlated interests of Prerogative and Prelacy. "The two last wars may either of them as truly be called "*Bellum Presbyteriale,* being raised by the ranting Presbyterians for erecting a new tyranny upon the ruins of the "old one." In No. 71 (Oct. 9–16) we have this image: "Liberty declared or possessed is like the Golden Fleece or "the Hesperian fruit, watcht by Argus his hundred eyes "or by ever-waking dragons." In No. 72 (Oct. 16–23), where the writer is ranging back in ancient History, he winds up a paragraph thus: "The main observation then arising out "of this discourse is this, that not only the name King but "the thing King (whether in the hands of one or of many) "was plucked up, root and branch, before ever the Romans "could attain to a full establishment of their rights and "freedoms." The leader in No. 75 (Nov. 6–13) opens with these words—"That the safety and liberty of a people consists "in a due qualification and succession of their supreme assemblies is, we suppose, now out of question." Throughout the leaders one notes the scholarship of the reasoner, as well as his earnestness. Classical allusions and historical references are frequent.

Now and then, on an important occasion, the regular series of expository leading articles is broken and a special leader interjected. The most striking instance of this is in No. 66 (Sept. 4–11), immediately after the Battle of Worcester. As a specimen of English journalism in the seventeenth century, even were Milton not concerned, the triumphant leading article of *Mercurius Politicus* on this great crowning mercy of Cromwell's may be quoted entire :—

"If after so many eminent discoveries of the will and purpose of God touching the establishment of this Commonwealth any man shall yet be so much of a sot as to continue a malignant, let him remember how God useth to dispose of his incorrigible and implacable enemies. But I perceive one main impediment that keeps men from quitting their old corrupt principles is the fear of being counted a Turncoat. Yet, know that, if God once declare, as it were from Heaven, against thy ways, thy principles, or thy party, then it is no dishonour, but ingenuity and thy duty, to turn: for He hath said in this case (Ps. vii. 12–13), If a man do not turn, He will whet his sword; He hath bent his bow and made it ready; He hath prepared for him the instruments of death and destruction.

"It was a loud declaration from Heaven at Naseby, when by a despised company it pleased God to decide the controversy, and also in the year 1647, when God owned the cause against a powerful faction both in Parliament and City. But in the year 1648 He spake louder in the midst of those alarms and insurrections, when by a small handful He overthrew Hamilton's numerous proud army in Lancashire, resettled the whole nation, and brought the King to the bar and block of Justice. Remember how eminently He hath appeared since, both in Ireland and Scotland, by many miraculous successes; but especially at Dunbar, where by a wearied and sick handful of men, cooped in a nook of land within the arms of the sea and encompassed with extreme disadvantages, He was pleased so visibly to make bare His own arm, and give a total rout to that numerous Scottish army in their own country, where, being well accomplished and provided both with numbers and necessaries, they reckoned themselves sure of spoil and victory. In all these particulars, and many others since, God did sufficiently signify His own will and pleasure; but His loudest declaration of all was mightily set forth in the late sudden revolutions and actions before and at Worcester, whereby He unquestionably appears to have given a full and final decision of the controversy, and seems as it were with His own finger to point out to all the world His resolutions for England.

"For the better clearing of this, let every man examine his own heart, and enter into a few serious considerations. First, consider the power of the Enemy, being a very formidable body and well provided, and having their spirits double-edged with revenge and despair, the strongest ingredients of resolution.

"Consider likewise the policy of the Enemy, that for the present laid aside all spleen against any one party, that he might the better make use of all parties, so that his army was a medley of all interests, a combination of men of all opinions. The rough Cavalier and the round Presbyterian were made to square together under a disguise of the Covenant, to draw in, if it were possible, almost the whole nation; whom they believed (and made foreign nations also believe they would be) ready to rise as one man for their assistance.

"Next consider the Enemy's hope of success, having gotten the start of our army, so as to march into the very heart of the land before they were put to any considerable stand, and at such a time as the militias in most counties were unsettled. Yet it pleased God they afterwards acted and proceeded with such alacrity that they immediately raised new forces in all parts: wherein it is very remarkable how willingly they marched to the main army, having a month's advance, and how bravely they fought, despatching their own work with good will and courage, so as to be able to return home again within the month.

"Consider the several links in this great chain of mercies: as first the notable success of Major General Lambert at our first landing in Fife; next our taking Saint Johnston [Perth], and the enemy's march into England, which (as God in his wisdom ordered it) was a great mercy, it proving the only means of shorning [*sic*] that tedious expensive war; after this, the taking of Stirling Castle, bragged by the Scots to be unconquerable; then that most seasonable mercy of Lilburne's routing the Earl of Derby's body, which might have grown up to another army; as also the surprising of the great Scotch lords, lairds, and their prime *boutefeus* of the priesthood, who were kindling new coals in Scotland; but above all that glorious day of decision at Worcester, followed since with the taking of Dundee, and other considerable passages which render the Scots' interest expiring in their own country. Add, to the sweetening of all these mercies, the little blood we have lost. Nor must it be forgotten what experiences we had in the appearances and alacrity of the London regiments, whose gallantry appeared, as in many other ways, so especially in this, that they had Young Tarquin's Declaration burnt at the heads of their regiments.

"Take two or three considerations more, and then we have done. Let the old Malignants and Cavaliers consider that, in what shape soever they have appeared, with what pretences soever they have clothed their confederacies, yet God hath found them out and confounded them. Let the New Malignants of the Presbyterian opinion consider how often and notoriously God hath checked them, and cursed their unrighteous combination with the Old Malignants. Let both Old and New consider what an inseparable curse is annexed (as I have often told you) to the family and interest of the Tarquins, that it proves ruin and destruction to all that own it. Let England herself and all the nations about consider what God hath done for England, and how in this auspicious time of trial He gave in the hearts of the people to live and die for the present Government. Lastly, let all parties consider it is high time to lay aside animosities and unite again upon the common interests of our nation; and there is no doubt that the Parliament will consider that, as God hath His design of glory in all these things, so it should be their design to improve them all to that end, and for the ease and benefit of so willing and obedient a people."

Milton certainly licensed this leading article on the Battle of Worcester, and passed it for the press. It was an occasion when the Latin Secretary of the Commonwealth, supervising the chief official journal of the Commonwealth, would see that something suitable should appear. A more interesting question, however, suggests itself. May not Milton have written the article himself, or dictated the substance of it? And this question may be enlarged. May not Milton's own hand be discernible in the more serious articles of *Mercurius Politicus* through the whole time of his registered censorship of that journal, if not from a little while before? To decide a question when it can be decided is a duty; but it is also a duty to leave a question undecided when there is room for doubt. That is the case here. I can *conceive* the article on Worcester Battle to have been a hurried composition or dictation of Milton, lowering his habitual style somewhat, to adapt it to Needham's journal. So, in others of the articles, including some from which quotations have been given, I have come upon passages of such a Miltonic strain that I could *suppose* them possibly Milton's. On the other hand, in no complete article or long continuous passage have I felt positively sure, from the internal evidence, that I was reading Milton, while at the same time there is the adverse evidence, of whatever worth it may be, lying in the fact that we have no attestation anywhere by Milton himself that he contributed to Needham's journal, and in the fact that Needham was always identified with *Mercurius Politicus* by his contemporaries, and credited with what appeared there. But then, if Needham did write the article on the Battle of Worcester and other similar articles, it must have been Needham greatly metamorphosed. The difference is enormous between the dull drollery of the leading articles with which Needham started the journal, a continuation as it was of the grosser scurrility and cleverer ribaldry by which he had made his fame as a journalist on the other side, and the earnest reasoning and pleading of the later leading articles after Milton had been charged with the censorship. True, there are pamphlets of Needham's, in his own name, which show that he could write seriously; but I have not seen anything of his of a serious kind nearly so good as the best leaders in *Mercurius Politicus* through the year 1651, or in a spirit so high and religious. On the whole, I am quite sure that Milton's connexion with Needham's newspaper was not a merely nominal one, or without effects. If the effects consisted in such a spiritual metamorphosis of Needham as to make a new man of him, *that* was sufficiently remarkable; but I suspect something more.[1]

Passing from Milton's official employments to his more domestic and personal life in his Whitehall residence, we have to record the recent birth there (March 16, 1650–1) of his third child, a son, christened John after himself. "My son John was born on Sunday, March the 16th, at about half-past nine at night: 1650" was the record of the fact by Milton himself in his wife's Bible.[2] This child, Milton's only son,

---

[1] Readers will have noted for themselves some Miltonic particles of expression in the quotations given from Needham's journal. *Strook*, as the past participle of *strike*, is a Miltonic form; but I am bound to say I have met with it in Needham's own writing. The image of the "Hesperian fruit watched by Argus," &c., quoted from the leader in No. 71, reminds one strongly of *Comus*, 393 et seq.

[2] The Bible, an octavo edition of 1636 printed by Young, was in the possession of Milton's granddaughter, Mrs. Foster in Jan. 1749—50, when she was living in Cock Lane, near Shoreditch Church. Dr. Birch, who visited her there on the 6th of that month, examined it, and has left an account of it (Add. MSS. in British Museum 4244 f. 53: so Mr. Hunter gives the reference in his *Milton Gleanings*, p. 34). On a blank leaf Milton had entered the births of all his children very particularly. Thus, for the two daughters born before this time:—"Anne, my daughter, was born July the 29th, the day of the Monthly Fast, between six and seven, or about half an hour after six, she living: 1646;" "Mary, my daughter, was born on Wednesday, October 25, on the Fast Day, in the morning about six o'clock: 1648." See a previous mention of this book in connexion with the birth of the eldest daughter, III. 483, note.

Phillips tells us, "through the ill-usage or bad constitution of an ill-chosen nurse, died an infant." The birth connects itself with the completion and publication of the *Defensio pro Populo Anglicano.* When the little death occurred is not so certain. Phillips's words seem to imply that the child lived for some time, and we shall find farther evidence to that effect.

Mrs. Powell and her suit were still very troublesome. The stage to which Milton's concern in that business had been brought at our last cognisance of it on the 4th of March 1650–1 (ante pp. 236–246) was that the composition fine on the Wheatley property, of which he had taken possession as one of his father-in-law's creditors, had been fixed at £130, the deduction which he had claimed on account of the £26 13*s*. 4*d*. a year he was paying to Mrs. Powell as her thirds on the property not having been allowed by the Haberdashers' Hall Commissioners. From that stage there were some curious advances in the course of 1651.

Milton, though he must have thought the decision of the Haberdashers' Hall Commissioners exorbitant, at once acquiesced in it. Before the 12th of March, 1650–1, not waiting for the full fortnight granted for the payment of the first moiety of the composition fine of £130, he had paid that moiety, and had the sequestration of the Wheatley property suspended; and before the 27th of the same month of March he had paid the remaining moiety, thus clearing the sequestration altogether. At the same time, however, the Commissioners having disallowed Mrs. Powell's thirds of £26 13*s*. 4*d*. from the revenues, and so declared Milton not to be legally liable for that outlay, he had discontinued it, until Mrs. Powell could have the decision altered. That lady was equal to the emergency. On the 19th of April she presented another brief petition to the Commissioners for Compositions, recapitulating her often-told story. She had no jointure, nor "anything at all left her but her thirds, which is due by law for the maintenance of herself and eight children"; Mr. Milton, she understands, has compounded for the Wheatley property which had been part of her husband's estate; she humbly prays, therefore, that somehow or other she may have "her thirds as formerly" from that property "for the maintenance of herself and poor children." The decision of the Commissioners, inscribed on the Petition, is "The Petitioner left to the law": i. e. they abide by the opinion that Mrs. Powell is not entitled to her thirds from Mr. Milton, and she must go to law if she disputes that opinion. For three months this seems to have silenced Mrs. Powell; but in July she returned to the charge in another document. I arrange it for the eye in its several parts, and italicise some passages :—

I. Mrs. Powell's Petition.—"To the Honourable the Commissioners for Compounding, &c., the Humble Petition of Anne Powell, widow, the relict of Richard Powell, of Foresthill, in the County of Oxon, deceased, sheweth :—That the Petitioner brought £3000 portion to her late husband, and is now left in a most sad condition, *the Estate left being but £80 per annum, the thirds whereof is but £26 13s. 4d. to maintain herself and eight children.* The said estate being extended by Jo. Milton on a statute staple for a debt of £300, for which he hath compounded with your Honours on the Act of the 1st of August, *and therein allowance given him for the Petitioner's thirds,* yet the said Mr. Milton expects your further order thereon before he will pay the same. She therefore humbly prayeth your Honours' order and direction to the said Mr. Milton for the payment of her said thirds, and the arrears thereof, *to preserve her and her children from starving.* And, as in duty bound, &c.

"Anne Powell."

II. Notes by some Agent or Official on behalf of the Petitioner :—(1) "Mrs. Powell—By the law she might recover her thirds without doubt; but she is so extreme poor she hath not wherewithal to prosecute; and besides Mr. Milton *is a harsh and choleric nan, and married Mrs. Powell's daughter, who would be undone if any such course were taken against him by Mrs. Powell, he having turned away his wife heretofore for a long space upon some other occasion.*" (2) "This note ensuing Mr. Milton writ, whereof this is a copy: 'Although I have compounded for my 'extent, and shall be so much the longer in receiving my debt, 'yet at the request of Mrs. Powell, in regard of her present neces- 'sities, I am contented, as far as belongs to my consent, to allow 'her the thirds of what I receive from the estate, if the Commis- 'sioners shall so order it that what I allow her may not be 'reckoned upon my accompt.'"

III. Decision of the Commissioners, dated July 16, 1651 :—

"The estate is wholly extended, and a saving as to the thirds *prayed but not granted:* We cannot therefore allow the thirds to the Petitioner."

Of one thing there is no doubt. Milton's relations to Mrs. Powell, and his recollections of her behaviour to him since he had married her daughter, were not such as to dispose him, in the circumstances, to make her a gratuitous allowance of £26 13*s*. 4*d*. a year, or what would be equivalent to about £95 a year now. He had been allowing her this sum since his entry upon the Wheatley property, because the property could afford it and because he understood her to have a legal right to it as her widow's thirds; but, when the Act of August 1650 touching Extents and Mortgages had imposed a fine on the property which he had not expected, and when moreover the Commissioners under the Act would not recognise the property as burdened with the widow's thirds, but had in fact made him pay a fine heavier by about £55 than it would have been had there been such a charge, then he had stopped or suspended the allowance. He was not to make *himself* responsible for Mrs. Powell's thirds, when the law had treated the property on which he had been paying them as subject to no such responsibility, and had mulcted him already, on that supposition, of a sum equal to two years of those thirds in advance. On the other hand, it is equally clear that he was willing to go on paying the thirds as before out of the income of that property, notwithstanding the unexpected fine upon it, if only she could settle with the Commissioners about that portion of the fine which related to those thirds. He had even tried to assist her application to the Commissioners by giving her a written promise to that effect. All this considered, however, there is still the fact that Mrs. Powell pleaded that the £26 13*s*. 4*d*. she had been receiving from Milton was the sole dependence of herself and her eight children, and that the arrears and the continued payment of those supposed thirds of hers on the Wheatley property, now stopped by Milton, were necessary to prevent them from "starving." This is strong language; and, were it true, we should be somewhat perplexed. All depends, then, on Mrs. Powell's veracity. Now, anything like collusion with Milton in her representations of extreme poverty is not to be supposed. Milton cannot but have been aware that Mrs. Powell's chances with the Commissioners would be increased by proofs of the smallness of her legal dues and expectations; he may even have silently reserved any intended benevolence till the result should be seen; but he cannot have stopped the allowance, or seemed to stop it, merely to assist Mrs. Powell in constructing a plea *ad misericordiam.* My own impression, therefore, on the whole, is that Mrs. Powell's plea of absolute destitution, if she were bereft of the Wheatley thirds, was a gross exaggeration, and that Milton knew it, but thought contradiction on his part uncalled-for or unbecoming. In confirmation, we may remember the lady's constant anxiety in previous documents to rate her means at the lowest, even to the inaccuracy of adhering to her dead husband's valuation of the Wheatley property, while she still thought she had an interest in it, at £40 a year, whereas Milton, when he came into possession of it, found it worth £80 a year, and returned it at that value for taxation. We may also note the gradual increase of intensity in her descriptions of her poverty in the successive documents, until in the present nothing but "starving" is the phrase that will do. Then, in disguise of the fact that she wants Milton to continue to her the annuity, as her legal due, after the Commissioners at least had pronounced it not to be such, what a wildness in the assertion of her petition that allowance had been given for that annuity to Milton by their Honours in his composition, when that was precisely what their Honours had *not* done, and the stoppage of the annuity had arisen from their *not* doing it! Farther, with the same regardlessness of means, if only they will help her case, there is the attack on Milton's character in her gossip with her agent, supported by the reckless version for the nonce of the story of Milton's separation from his wife immediately after their marriage. Nor is this all. For the first time in the present document is there the distinct affirmation that the thirds for the Wheatley property (now conceded at last as worth £80 a year) are the sole dependence of herself and her children. That certainly was not the fact. There was already a decree in her favour, in her suit against the Oxfordshire sequestrators, entitling her to the recovery of about £500 worth of her late husband's goods. The decree had not yet had effect, but it might be enforced. On the principle of that decree, also, she had a further claim against Parliament itself for £400 worth of timber illegally seized and distributed. Finally, not to speak of any assistance she may have been receiving from relatives whose obligations were closer than Milton's, there was the unfathomable secret of the meaning of her late husband's will, in respect of the nature and extent of the continued interest of herself and her family in the other piece of Wheatley property, which had passed to Sir Edward Powell, and in the main or Foresthill estate, which had passed ostensibly to the Pyes. About the first nothing more appears on record than has been stated already; but about the second there were still intricate transactions and negotiations. On the 25th of March, 1651, or just when Milton had paid the whole of the composition fine for his Wheatley possession, the Commissioners for Compositions, ignoring entirely the claim of John Pye, Esq., for perfected ownership of the Foresthill property, and treating it for all purposes of the Act as merely the mortgaged property of a Delinquent, had fixed the composition fine for that property at £658 15*s.* 3*d.* To this assessment Mr. Pye had demurred, while yielding the main claim; and there had been fresh and very detailed accounts from him, in April and June, of the actual revenues of the property according to his books, with allegations that the fine had been "miscast." The matter had been remitted to the auditor, and was not settled at the time of Mrs. Powell's petition that Milton should be ordered to continue her annuity; but before the 22nd of October in the same year the fine had been commuted, on recalculation, to £572 12*s.* 3*d.*, that sum had been paid in full by Mr. Pye, and Foresthill was his, not in perfect ownership, as he had first solicited, but exactly as the Wheatley property was Milton's, i. e. to be held and enjoyed till the receipts from it should cover the debt for which it had been taken, with interest and damages, and the composition fine itself. Already, it appears from one of the documents in the process (April 18, 1651), the property, with one money payment by Mr. Powell, had yielded Pye £1769 18*s.* 9*d.*, leaving a balance of £1046 15*s.* 2*d.*, and the composition fine of £572 12*s.* 3*d.*, to be yet extracted from its revenues, before it could return to the Powells. To that happy event, a few years hence, and to other infalls besides, Mrs. Powell could look forward; and meanwhile I am sure she had other resources and potentialities than the annuity of £26 13*s.* 4*d.* for which she persecuted Milton. She was a brave and tenacious lady, however, and we shall meet her again.[1]

The fame of Milton's Answer to Salmasius had been steadily on the increase. In France, more particularly, it had been greatly promoted by the public burning of the book by the hands of the hangman at Paris and Toulouse. As far as Milton himself could learn, the burning at Paris, which seems to have been some time in June or July, had not been the act of the Government, but only of some city official, stimulated by the clergy.[2] The following continuation of our extracts from the correspondence of the learned friends Heinsius, Vossius, and Gronovius will show that the credit of the book on the continent generally had suffered nothing by that little incident, and will carry on the history of the book, and of Salmasius with it, to the end of the year.

"Salmasius is meditating his departure from this," writes Vossius from Stockholm to Heinsius at Leyden, July 12, 1651. The departure, however, did not take place immediately; and Salmasius was still at Stockholm, in the society of Queen Christina and her Court, when Heinsius wrote as follows to Gronovius at Deventer (July 15), giving him the latest Stockholm news: "Salmasius is proceeding with his thrashing of Milton, and the printing-presses of Sweden are hard

---

[1] The documents on which I have founded the account given of the progress of the Milton-Powell business through 1651 will be found in Hamilton's *Milton Papers* (Camden Society), Appendix, pp. 98—108, and text of the book, pp. 52—54.

[2] Def. Sec.

"at work in getting out that horrible book of his, in which, "as he boasts, he is to take occasion to confer immortality on "me and my father . . . Silence has been imposed by public "authority on our Graswinkel, who was preparing something "against Milton for Elzevir's press: this I had from himself "the other day, when I was at the Hague." On the 19th he again writes to Gronovius: "What Scribonius Magnus [i. e. "Salmasius] is plotting for me I do not know; but, whatever "it is, he will have done himself no good by it. He calls "Milton everywhere a 'Schoolmaster'; and yet, as those "who know the man tell me, he is of good family, and is said "to have passed his life hitherto, to his present age of hardly "more than forty years, as a private gentleman of handsome "means, in various travels and in assiduous studies, until "recently he was asked by the English Council of State to "undertake the office of Secretary to the Council. They say "he is a man of mild and courteous disposition, who professes "to have had no other reason for his severe attack on Scribonius than that Scribonius had treated many of the greatest "and most celebrated men in England with such disrespect "and had done grievous wrong by his most atrocious insults "to the whole English nation. If any Englishman were to "retort upon *me* for those verses of mine which you wot of, "should I not seem ridiculous to you if I swore he was egged "on by Scribonius?" About a fortnight later (Aug. 5) Vossius, again writing from Stockholm to Heinsius, tells him: "Salmasius takes it ill that Graswinkel has been forbidden "to proceed in his reply to Milton. But he is greatly delighted with the news that Milton's book has been publicly "burnt by the hangman at Paris. There is no need for me to "intrude my judgment about that book; but this I know, "that it is generally good books whose fate it is to perish or be "endangered in this way. Men come under the executioner's "hands for the most part for their crimes and depravity, but "books for their worth and excellence. Only the labours of "fools have no fear of such accidents. But they are greatly "mistaken who think they can extirpate the writings of "Milton and others in this way, since they rather shine out "with a certain wonderful increase of lustre by means of those "flames. What you write to me about Milton's circum- "stances agrees, I think, with what I hinted to you some "weeks ago." On the 19th of August Vossius tells Heinsius, "Salmasius is to set out from this in a day or two"; which piece of information, though addressed to Heinsius at Leyden, must have reached him not there, but at Paris, where he was halting a while on his way to Italy. From Paris, at all events, we find Heinsius writing on the 10th of September to Gronovius at Deventer, thus: "The rumour is constant here "that Salmasius has left Sweden . . . Whither he is bound "I know not. For in letters to his friends in this city he "threatens to give the Dutch the slip; to the Dutch, on the "other hand, he holds out hopes of his arrival among them. "I believe he is waiting for the issue of the King's affairs in "England, which are considered to be in a bad way [Sept. "10, 1651, in the French dating, was just three days before "the Battle of Worcester]. That *Royal Defence* of his has "made him very many enemies in France, so that I now "acknowledge the truth of the prediction of Blondel [David "Blondel, a French Protestant theologian]; for he declared "long ago that there was no scholar in those parts who, if he "were also a good man, would approve of that Defence. Sal- "masius is doing something towards establishing his fortunes "with the Condé; but Gaulminus, I think [Gilbert Gaulmin, "another French writer of the day], will muddle that business "as much as he can." In another letter, of Sept. 18, still from Paris, Heinsius positively informs Gronovius, "Salmasius "has now left Sweden and will presently be among you." By the last phrase he seems to mean that Salmasius is actually to come back to Holland, but that fortunately he himself will be in Italy before then, and will thus escape the brunt of the great man's formidable return, in his state of ferocious ill-humour over Milton's attack and other matters. What then must have been the feelings of Heinsius when a letter from Gronovius, dated from Deventer Oct. 17, overtook him at Venice, informing him that the joke at the Hague, Amsterdam, and other places in Holland, was that Heinsius's journey to Italy was all a pretence, and that in fact he had not stirred from Leyden, but was living there shut up in his father's house. Gronovius then goes on: "Arrival of the Dreadful "[*Adventus* τοῦ δεῖνα is the phrase, ὁ δεῖνα, by ellipsis, being "one of the nicknames in the Heinsian circle for Salmasius] "with huge rumours in his train. He is said to have received "a present of a carriage and four, and consequently they are "carrying hay into his house. An annual pension of 3000 "walloons [*vallensium*] is settled on him, with 1000 to his "wife if she should chance to survive him; besides a present "gift to the same of a pearl worth 2000 florins. About the "Defence of the *Defensio* all is uncertain. Some say that, "though it had been looked over by the Queen, and ordered "to be sent to press, it has been suppressed and forbidden in "consequence of the news of the Scottish Defeat [the Battle "of Worcester], and has been sent from Sweden to Paris, "where it is coming out; others say that not a bit of it has "yet been written. Milton's Book has been reissued in "London, enlarged and in splendid form. A great material "for rumours is the departure from Sweden at one and the "same time of the Dreadful, and Freinshemius, Boeclerus, and "Moucheron: some say the cause is exhaustion of [the "Queen's] finances, others the dislike of the nation to the "foreigners." If the interesting gossip of Gronovius here is correct, three others of Queen Christina's cluster of eminent men had left Sweden about the same time as Salmasius, though *his* departure quite eclipsed theirs.[1]

The mysterious retirement of Salmasius from the Queen of Sweden's Court in the beginning of September 1651, about a year after he had taken up his residence there with such ecstasies of welcome, and exactly six months after the thunderbolt of Milton's Book had descended upon him at Stockholm, is an incident which Milton himself always afterwards adverted to with a kind of savage satisfaction. In the meantime it is enough to quote two passages from his *Defensio Secunda* (1654) on the subject. "Salmasius was living there "[at Queen Christina's Court] a foreigner in great honour," says Milton, "when our *Defence* came upon him, at a moment "when he was fearing nothing of the kind. Immediately, "however, when that book had been perused by a number of "persons, the Queen, who had herself been among the first to "peruse it, abated nothing certainly of her former kindness "and munificence to her guest, herein consulting only her own "dignity; but, for the rest, if one may repeat what one has "often heard and what is no secret, there was so great a "change of people's opinions that he who but yesterday had "flourished in the highest favour was now almost out of "fashion, so that, taking his departure with good leave not "so long afterwards, he left but one thing in doubt with very "many, namely whether he arrived more in honour or went in "greater contempt away." Again, addressing Queen Christina herself, Milton says: "Although, at a time when that man "was by far the most celebrated in the world, from the fame "of his extraordinary learning and his patronage of the "King's cause, you invited him to your Court, and received "him with many honours, yet, when the answer to him came "forth, and you had perused it with singular equanimity, "and had consequently seen Salmasius convicted of effrontery "and most open corruptness, and that he had written much "that was trifling, much that was exaggerated, a good deal "that was false, and something too that was against himself "and contrary to his former sentiments,—to all which, when "you sent for him into your presence, as they report, he had "no sufficient reply to make,—then you were visibly so "troubled that from that time all were aware that you neither "showed the man such attention as before, nor thought much "of his ability or learning, and even (what was distinctly "unexpected) that you felt a decided inclination to the side of "his adversary. For what I had written against tyrants, you "said, could have no possible reference to *you*." This account of the facts seems quite consistent with the gossip we have quoted from the letters of Vossius and Heinsius; nor is it perhaps inconsistent with Christina's splendid generosity to Salmasius at his departure, or the kindly recollections of him and his which we find her professing in later years. She was a very independent young lady, and there is ample proof that she could withdraw her favour and restore it again as she found cause.—It is right, however, that the contrary version of the story should here be quoted. "Restored at last to "better health," says Clementius, the enthusiastic biographer of Salmasius, "he began to think of returning, the Queen on "the other hand opposing, and offering him the most hand-"some and ample terms, that she might retain him for ever "in her service. But, under obedience as he was to the "Curators of Leyden University, to whom also he had given "a promise that he would return, he could remain no longer. "To tell, however, with what liberality, with what marks of "kindness, she loaded him as he went away, and how unwil-"lingly she let him go, would take much space." Both the sons of Salmasius, Claude and Josias, the biographer adds, remained behind him in Sweden, very kindly treated, and in very honourable appointments.[1]

---

[1] Burmann's *Sylloge Epistolarum*, III. 620, 274, 276, 621, 623, 282—3, 284, 286.

Poor Salmasius! one sees him back in Leyden at the end of 1651, externally maintaining all his former dignity, but his face sourer and sulkier than ever, and his very dreams disturbed with the consciousness of that book of Milton's hung round his neck. Where was the crushing reply he had threatened, the reply that was to send Milton and the English Parliament to perdition together? Which of the rumours on the subject was the correct one? Had it been ready for press at Stockholm, nay sent to press, but stopped and made unpublishable at last by the Battle of Worcester? Or was Gronovius's shrewd guess the truer one? Was the Reply as yet wholly unwritten, or merely sketched? In that case, the chances of its publication had been considerably affected by the delay. The Battle of Worcester had come in aid of the argument of Milton's book. If the States of Holland even in the preceding year had prohibited the circulation of Salmasius's original book as offensive to England, were they likely now to countenance a sequel to it?

Would nobody in the whole world, then, say a word in the meantime for poor Salmasius? Yes, while Graswinkel and others were delaying or postponing, one unknown person in or about Antwerp had sent out a duodecimo entitled "*Pro Rege et Populo Anglicano Apologia, contra Johannis Polypragmatici* (*alias Miltoni Angli*) *Defensionem Destructivam Regis et Populi Anglicani: Antverpiæ, apud Hieronymum Verdussen,* 1651" ("Apology for the King and People of England, against the Defence, destructive of King and People of England, by John the Multifarious, alias Milton the Englishman: Antwerp, Printed by Jerome Verdussen, 1651"). The book, which, in compliment to Salmasius, is dedicated "to the most celebrated University of Leyden," consists of 195 pages of text, besides introductory matter. It begins thus:—

---

[1] Milton's Def. Sec. and *Vita Salmasii* by Clementius, p. lii.

"To the Reader:—What the most distinguished Salmasius had carefully written to defend the rights and honour of Charles, Monarch of Britain, slain by the hands of wicked men, burst into light [*in lucem erupit*] in one impression only, and that with great difficulty, with so much hatred in these last times does the world persecute truth; but what the rascally Milton has spitefully elaborated in defamation of the late King and for the subversion of hereditary rule over subjects, of that there are so many copies that I know not to which I should refer the reader, so are men inflamed with the love of lies and calumnies. I have used the volume in 16mo. as the cheapest, unwilling to spend a farthing more than I could help on such an egregious trifler; nor would I have bought this copy but that I feared his venom might spread and poison many ignorant people, unless an antidote to the Rebellion [*Rebellionis Alexipharmacum*] should be administered in good time; and so, as the most learned Salmasius was too far away, I have thrown what water I had at hand upon the sulphurous fire, to keep it down till Salmasius shall drown it with his own full flood. Farewell!"

After this address to the Reader, in translating which I have tried to keep the sprawling syntax and jumbled metaphor of the original, there follows more prefatory matter, in the same style, e.g.:—

"I confess indeed that I labour under a disadvantage in replying to this wily fellow, in that I am despoiled of all the goods and helps of life, and am superior to him only in virtue, which he neither seeks nor cares for, not content with his victory gotten by violence and injustice, but tearing and devouring his victims like a cruel beast, perchance the fiercer because, like the Devil, he has but a short time; for the more he stirs his dunghill the greater the stench he will daily raise to the disgust of all good people, because great is truth, and will prevail when that trashy and windy writer shall fly away in smoke, however at present, priding himself on his names and titles hung on the frontispiece of his book, like a Pharisee making broad his phylacteries,[1] he may attack with his revilings and scurrilous jibes, as though he were speaking of some nameless person, that most learned man Salmasius, who will be illustrious to all ages mainly for his Royal Defence, whereas in time to come the name of Milton will be, &c.

"I confess that my lucubrations are unworthy of such patronage [that of the University of Leyden]: if the following pages of ours are compared to Salmasius, we know they are nothing; but what can be expected of a refugee tossed about on such waves of miseries, and who has passed many years of his life among the inhospitable Caucasians?"

The book itself takes the form of a long series of passages and phrases quoted from Milton, with replies in paragraphs, the whole divided into ten chapters. Just one more specimen:—

"I am not such an audacious Phormio as to compare myself to Salmasius because I answer the vain talk of Milton as Milton showed himself a boasting Thraso in daring to oppose Salmasius and to load him with reproaches, expecting to get some small glory by so doing, though all ingenuous and learned men will with one mouth confess that, if the strife is to be settled by authority, they would give more credit to one Salmasius than to a thousand thousand Miltons."

Copies of the book having found their way into England, and the author having revealed himself so far as to indicate that he was a refugee Englishman of the clerical species, current report at once fastened on Dr. John Bramhall, the ex-Bishop of Derry in Ireland, as the likely man. He had been abroad since 1644, one of the most bustling of the Royalist refugees, and had latterly been much about Charles II. at the Hague. How a book so silly, so evidently the production of some imbecile, who could write very bad Latin, should ever have been attributed to a man of Bramhall's talent, is extremely surprising. Who the real author was will appear in due time. Meanwhile there are reasons why the report that he was Bramhall should remain uncontradicted.[2]

---

[1] Did some foreign edition contain such flourishes, by way of designation of Milton on the title-page?

[2] In a copy in the British Museum "*Auctore Johanne Bramhall*" is written on the title-page in a contemporary

Another book of the same year, published probably before the Antwerp reply to Milton's *Defensio*, was an English reply to his *Eikonoklastes.* It was a small quarto of 267 pages with this title:—"Εἰκων ᾿Ακλαστος: *The Image Unbroken: A Perspective of the Impudence, Falshood, Vanitie, and Prophannes, published in a Libell entitled* Εἰκονοκλαστης *against* Εἰκων Βασιλικη *or the Portraicture of his Sacred Majestie in his Solitudes and Sufferings. Printed Anno Dom.* 1651." This book also is a wretched one, the English and the pointing so bad that one could even suppose it to be the work of an illiterate. Nevertheless, being anonymous, it was fathered by some on Bramhall too. Here are specimens enough of its matter and style:—

"His Majesty's Book hath passed the censure of the greatest part of the learned world, being translated into the most spread languages, and strangers honour his memory and abhor his murderers; but such as regard not the all-seeing eye of God beholding their wickedness despise the judgment of the whole world, and there is a man found out that will break down the united reason of mankind, and he tells men they must take his word above their own and all men's reason, this he undertakes that looks on Kings as ants and the King's book as wanting all moment of solidity, and if, as he chose the title of Eikonoklastes, he had written his book in a foreign or learned language, his unfaithfulness and impudence would be as open and odious as his vanity is ridiculous."

"He says '*it is not to get a name, for no man ever got honour by writing against a King, being strong in legions, weak in arguments.*'—Some men have desired a name for brutish arrogance against princes, and that may be the author's ambition, but however it have fared with others that have spit their venom in the faces of kings, it's certain he hath lighted upon the prediction of his own success, for he will gain only infamy by this undertaking."

"His meaning is, as follows afterward, that the King used a prayer taken out of Sir Philip Sidney's *Arcadia.* After the first edition of his Majesty's book, the printers, finding the great vent of them, in the following editions printed prayers and other things not belonging to the book. Among these prayers there is a prayer taken out of the *Arcadia.* That prayer is neither made by a heathen woman, nor to a heathen god, but is composed by the

---

hand; nay, in a copy of the second edition of the book in the same Library, dated 1652 (for the book did reach a second edition), there is the inscription, "*Auctore J. Bramhall, Archep. Armagh.*" Phillips in his Life of Milton in 1694 still speaks of it as possibly Bramhall's, which is the stranger because long before then the real author had claimed it.

author, a Christian, and the author is not thought to unchristen prayer by it, the libeller himself saying the book in its kind is full of worth and wit, but as his outcry hath no cause from the matter, so here is no evidence of the fact that his Majesty made use of that prayer or popt into the Bishop's hands as a relique of his exercise, though he might warrantably have used it and professed it."

Much abler replies to Milton were to be forthcoming than either the *Eikon Aklastos* or the Antwerp *Apologia contra Joannem Polypragmaticum;* but these two, after a fashion, were tributes to his celebrity in 1651. That year, we may say, had made him, for the first time, a man of European note. From that year forward his name was more widely known in France, The United Provinces, Germany, Switzerland, Italy, Sweden, Denmark, and other foreign countries, than perhaps that of any man of the English Commonwealth after Cromwell; and from that year we may date the extraordinary eagerness of scholarly foreigners visiting London to see Milton, and be introduced to him. One such foreigner, the German Christopher Arnold, afterwards Professor of History at Nuremberg, describes an interview with him in a letter dated London, August 7, 1651. The letter, which is a long one, is addressed to Dr. George Richter, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Altorf, and relates in a gossiping manner the writer's impressions of England after he had been in it a few weeks and had visited Oxford and Cambridge as well as London. A part may be worth translating:—

"In London I enjoy a familiar acquaintance with the great Selden, who, admitting me readily into his own well-furnished library, takes me also sometimes to certain gardens on the Thames, where there are rare Greek and Roman inscriptions, stones, marbles: the reading of which is actually like viewing Greece and Italy at once within the bounds of Great Britain. From the Cottonian Library, of which he has charge, he has several times let me have a sight of important Anglosaxon manuscripts; and he spontaneously offered me letters of recommendation to the Oxford Librarian, John Rous, a man of the truest politeness. I have besides formed a peculiarly intimate acquaintance with the Archbishop of Armagh, James Usher, Primate of all Ireland; and whether I ought to admire and venerate most his singular politeness or his divine powers of memory I am quite at a loss: when the talk turns on matters of antiquity, he often recites you, without hesitation, whole pages from the Greek and Latin historians.

John Durie has become my closest companion near Westminster, a man, as you know, who is affability itself, and who is now appointed keeper of what was formerly the King's Library in St. James's Palace; where, in a chapel, built originally, as they say, for the expected Spanish bride of Charles, new book-cases are now being set up. I had some hope of being able to examine the King's manuscripts; but Durie has with all seriousness refused to receive untitled books which they try to thrust upon him in heaps; they say too that the most precious manuscripts of that library were offered in gift to the Dutch ambassador immediately after the King's death and very negligently kept. That personage, however, who is truly cordial-minded, dines almost every day with the Parliament-men, and I have very frequent conversations with him about the state of the new Republic. The strenuous Defender of the same, Milton, enters readily into talk: his style is pure and his writing most terse. Of the old English Theologians and their commentaries on the Books of Holy Scripture, the erudition of which I can attest, he seemed to me altogether to entertain a too harsh, if not an unjust, opinion. John Greaves, the Oxford Professor of Astronomy, and highly accomplished in the Arabic and Persic tongues, is also very kind and attentive to me. Francis Junius, the relative of Gerhard John Vossius, and a most cultivated man, is now preparing for the press a Grammar of the Anglosaxon tongue and an Anglosaxon Dictionary, and has told me all about his doings in the kindest manner. . . . Moreover, Mr. William Petty, Professor of Medicine in Gresham College, London, has entertained me with several useful and yet charming dialogues on the wonders of nature and mechanical appliances. The most honourable Mr. Fox, formerly travelling companion to the Earl of Arundel in his Embassy to our invincible Emperor, has obtained such free admission for me into the Arundel Gardens that they are at all times open to me for the inspection of the statues, paintings, marbles, inscriptions, urns, and vases. Meric Casaubon, now living here in a pleasant suburban retirement, communicates with me by letter. For the rest, I have given myself so much to the society of Hermann Mylius, recently come as envoy from the illustrious Count of Oldenburg to the English Republic, that I often live with him, his lodgings being close to mine. The most eminent people here are much with him, such as the celebrated French preacher Jean d'Espagne, Durie, the Dutch Secretary, and others. . . . Of Church matters what shall I write? The Independents are now the masters in the Church, and it is they who preach most before the magistrates and notables. They have their sermons in the upper Church of St. Paul's; the Presbyterians theirs in the underground part. Their published eloquence keeps every public place astir, where also the *speeches* on each self-same recent piece of business are sold at a wild rate with great noise. From both Universities and various counties divines run up to town to preach before Parliament, and not without permission by Parliament itself of such absence from their charges; for they so increase the number of parochial livings and ecclesiastical offices that in divers places divines hold simultaneously as many strings to their bow as there are needed words for a hexameter or even a whole couplet. Mr. White, for example, is said, so the line goes, to have received the following offices :—

Usury, St. Dunstan's, Paul's, Christchurch, Sal'sbury, Windsor.

And Mr. Hill's winnings are given in the following distich :—

Westminster, Martin's, Assembly, Trinity, Tichmarsh,
Michäel, Procan. (sede vacante) Mary.

These exquisite verses, going at Cambridge, I communicate to you with all the goodwill with which I lately received them from a very trusty friend . . . The leader of the Independents, Hugh Peters, and other holy men (such they seem at least), are becoming captains, lieutenants, and ensigns, marching men about in London and elsewhere. The said Hugh has a regiment in Ireland, whose valour General Cromwell himself so highly extols as to reckon this one preacher worth a hundred soldiers: always the first in attacking a rampart, he is followed by the rest so punctually that already he has taken several towns in Ireland by his sheer alacrity. On the Lord's day, after the sermons, enthusiasts and fanatics hold their own evening exercises of worship. Last Sunday I heard four working-men holding forth, as preachers-extraordinary, in an obscure street near the Thames, called St. Lawrence Lane, or now commonly *Heresy Street:* they style themselves, specially, *The Christians.* In a suburb, called Clerkenwell Green, they have imprisoned *The Ranters,* whom I take to be essentially schismatics and violators of religion: they call a man not *a man,* but *a fellow-creature:* i. e. *creaturam sociam, einen creatur-gesellen* . . . This more I add, that in almost all towns, halls, colleges, schools, churches, courts, and bridges, the statues, images, inscriptions, and titles of royalty are being destroyed by order of the authorities." [1]

The enthusiastic Arnold remained in London for some months and must have seen more of Milton. He was a collector of autographs; and in an Album of his, now in the British Museum, containing autographs of distinguished men collected by him in Germany, Holland, and England between 1649 and 1672, one finds Usher's name, Selden's, Petty's, and Milton's, as among his prized captures in this particular London visit of 1651. Milton's contribution takes the form of a modified quotation from 2 Cor. xii. 9 in the Greek, thus:

---

[1] *Georgi Richteri, Ejusque Familiarium Epistolæ Selectiores,* Norembergæ 1662. The same letter mentions some of Milton's books.

“ Ἐν ἀσθενείᾳ τελειοῦμαι” (“ I am made perfect in weakness”), with a Latin sequel to this effect: “ To the very learned “ Mr. Christopher Arnold, my most obliging friend, I have “ given this, in memory both of his own worth and of my “ regard for him. London. A.D. 1651. Novem: 19. JOANNES “ MILTONIUS.” Only the signature seems to be in Milton's hand, the Greek motto and the Latin inscription having been first written very elegantly from his dictation, to receive his signature.[1]

There is a very credible tradition that Milton, in his capacity as Secretary for Foreign Tongues, was allowed “ a weekly table” for the entertainment of such foreigners of distinction as came about the Council on Embassy business, or were otherwise known to be in London.[2] If so, he must have seen a good deal of such company in that convenient way through 1651, though not so much as in the next and following years, when foreign embassies and agencies in London were matters more of established course. Alas! hardly beyond this year was the phrase “ to *see* company” to be applicable to Milton.

---

[1] Facsimile in Sotheby's *Milton Ramblings,* plate opposite p. 112, with account of the Album, p. 113.

[2] The tradition is traced to Mr. Thomas Bradbury, an eminent dissenting minister, who had it from Jeremiah White, who had been chaplain some time to Cromwell. Milton's “ weekly table,” it is added, begun under the Commonwealth, was continued by Cromwell. See Mitford, Appendix to Life of Milton, p. clxvi.

CHAPTER VII.

ANNALS OF THE COMMONWEALTH: FOURTH YEAR AND FRAGMENT OF A FIFTH. DEC. 1, 1651—APRIL 20, 1653.

COUNCIL OF STATE OF THE FOURTH YEAR.

Twenty-one members had been continued from last Council. Fifteen of these had been members of all the preceding Councils: viz. CROMWELL, WHITLOCKE, ST. JOHN, VANE, ROLLE, LISLE, BRADSHAW, HASILRIG, BOND, SCOTT, PUREFOY, WALTON, HARRINGTON, SIR WILLIAM MASHAM, and SIR GILBERT PICKERING: two had been members of the second and third Councils: viz. CHALLONER and GURDON; and four had been members of the third Council only; viz. FLEETWOOD, CAREW, LOVE, and SALWAY. Of the remaining twenty members, expressly elected to this Council, and not in the last, eight had been members of the first and second Councils: viz. HENRY MARTEN, VISCOUNT LISLE, SIR WILLIAM CONSTABLE, CORNELIUS HOLLAND, ALDERMAN PENNINGTON, ALEXANDER POPHAM, ANTHONY STAPLEY, and ROBERT WALLOP, and two had been members of the second Council only: viz. HERBERT MORLEY and SIR PETER WENTWORTH. Members totally new to the Council were these ten (the asterisk denoting a Regicide):—

Admiral Robert Blake.
Abraham Burrel, Esq.
John Corbet, Esq.
*John Dixwell, Esq.
*John Downes, Esq.
William Hay, Esq.
Henry Herbert, Esq.
William Masham, Esq.
Henry Neville, Esq.
Philip, Earl of Pembroke (son of the late Earl).

N.B.—In accordance with the regulation of Parliament at the appointment of this Fourth Council of State (ante p. 310), the permanent Presidency of the Council, hitherto held by Bradshaw, ceased, and the meetings of the Council throughout the year were presided over by the following members in succession, each chosen by the Council for a period of four weeks or less—BRADSHAW (chosen Dec. 1, 1651), WHITLOCKE (Dec. 29), HASILRIG (Jan. 26, 1651–2), Viscount Lisle (Feb. 23), Commissioner Lisle (March 22), Chief Justice Rolle (April 19), Vane (May 17), the Earl of Pembroke (June 14), Mr. Bond (July 12), Purefoy (Aug. 9), Sir James Harrington (Sep. 7), Sir William Constable (Oct. 5), Sir William Masham (Oct. 27), Sir William Constable again (Nov. 22).

FIFTH COUNCIL OF STATE.

Elected by ballot Nov. 24 *and* 25, 1652 *: Installed Dec.* 1, 1652.

Twenty-one members of the Fourth Council were continued : viz. Cromwell (at the head of the poll, with 114 votes out of 121 voting papers given in), Whitlocke, St. John, Rolle, Vane, Hasilrig, Scott, Morley, Bond, Purefoy, Bradshaw, Gurdon, Mr. Lisle, Walton, Harrington, Love, Sir William Masham, Challoner, Sir Peter Wentworth, Sir Gilbert Pickering. Of the twenty members elected to this Council, and not in the last, three had been in the first, second, and third Councils: viz. Lord Grey of Groby, Sir Henry Mildmay, and Philip Skippon ; one had been in the first and second: viz. the Earl of Salisbury; and thirteen had been in the third only: viz. Goodwin, Alderman Allen, Colonel Thompson, Strickland, Attorney-General Prideaux, Sir John Trevor, Thomas Lister, Sir John Bourchier, William Cawley, Sir William Brereton, John Fielder, William Say, and Major-General Harrison. Three members totally new to the Council were Colonel Algernon Sidney, Colonel Richard Norton, and *Colonel Richard Ingoldsby ; the last of whom had been one of the Regicides.

N.B.—The Presidents of this Council in succession were — Whitlocke (Dec. 1), Rolle (Dec. 29), Bradshaw (Jan. 26, 1652–3), Earl of Salisbury (Feb. 23), Bond (March 23).

DEATH OF IRETON: JOHN LILBURNE AGAIN: HIS BANISHMENT: STABILITY OF THE COMMONWEALTH AFTER THE BATTLE OF WORCESTER: THE RUMP GOVERNMENT IN ITS RELATIONS WITH CROMWELL: MEASURES FOR THE UNION OF SCOTLAND WITH THE COMMONWEALTH: COMMISSIONERS FOR THE UNION SENT TO SCOTLAND: FEELINGS OF THE SCOTS ON THE SUBJECT: SUCCESS OF THE COMMISSIONERS: ACT OF INCORPORATION BROUGHT IN AND THE UNION DECLARED: ENGLISH ADMINISTRATION IN SCOTLAND, AND STATE OF THAT COUNTRY: VIEW OF THE STATE OF IRELAND: LAMBERT

APPOINTED TO SUCCEED IRETON THERE: THE POST DECLINED BY LAMBERT, AND FLEETWOOD APPOINTED: ACTS FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF IRELAND: FLEETWOOD'S IRISH ADMINISTRATION: EMBASSY FROM THE UNITED PROVINCES: NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE SAME: ANIMOSITY BETWEEN THE ENGLISH AND THE DUTCH: ENCOUNTER BETWEEN BLAKE AND VAN TROMP IN THE DOWNS: ADDITIONAL AMBASSADOR FROM THE PROVINCES: FAILURE OF THE EMBASSY: WAR BETWEEN THE DUTCH AND THE COMMONWEALTH: BLAKE'S NAVAL BATTLES AND VICTORIES: SYNOPSIS OF THE RELATIONS OF THE COMMONWEALTH WITH OTHER FOREIGN POWERS: INTERNAL AFFAIRS OF ENGLAND: QUESTIONS OF RETRENCHMENT, POLITICAL OBLIVION, LAW-REFORM, PAUPERISM, AND REGULATION OF THE PRESS: GRAND QUESTION OF *THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL*: WHAT WAS INVOLVED IN THIS QUESTION: COMMITTEE OF PARLIAMENT ON THE SUBJECT: PROPOSALS OF CERTAIN MINISTERS TO THE COMMITTEE: CONFLICT OF OPINION AND APPEALS TO CROMWELL: PROVISIONAL VOTES IN PARLIAMENT ABOUT TITHES: ROGER WILLIAMS AGAIN IN ENGLAND: HIS ACTIVITY: YEAR'S DELIBERATION OF THE *COMMITTEE* FOR *THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL*: RESULTS: PRECARIOUSNESS OF THE RUMP GOVERNMENT: INDEPENDENT AUTHORITY OF CROMWELL: HIS PRIVATE MEDITATIONS: THE ARMY IN ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND: PETITION OF THE ARMY OFFICERS: ITS EFFECTS: BILL FOR DISSOLUTION OF THE EXISTING PARLIAMENT AND ELECTION OF A NEW REPRESENTATIVE: DIFFICULTIES: MEETINGS OF CROMWELL AND THE OFFICERS: SCHISM ON THE BILL FOR A NEW REPRESENTATIVE: HISTORICAL DOUBTS AND SPECULATIONS: NARRATIVE OF THE EVENTS OF APRIL 13—20, 1653: CROMWELL'S DISSOLUTION OF THE RUMP AND OF THE COUNCIL OF STATE.

HARDLY had the Fourth Council of State assumed office when news was received (Dec. 8, 1651) of the death of Ireton.

He had died at Limerick, Nov. 27, of some violent illness, called plague, caught by exposure and fatigue during the siege of that town. The loss of so eminent a Republican, at the age of only forty-one, was widely regretted, and is said to have "struck a great sadness into Cromwell." Orders were issued for bringing his body to London for honourable funeral; and handsome provision was at once enacted for his widow, Mrs. Bridget Ireton, Cromwell's eldest daughter.[1]

Another incident of the beginning of the year was the reappearance of John Lilburne in a new variety of his old character. Since we last saw him, in the winter of 1649–50, he had been comparatively silent, having found the existing government too strong, and having also been somewhat pacified by an Act of Parliament, good-naturedly procured by Cromwell and Henry Marten, securing him the arrears claimed from the State on old grounds. A family grievance, however, had given him more private scope for activity. An uncle of his, George Lilburne, had been ejected in 1649, by the Committee of Sequestrators for the County of Durham, from a valuable mining property in that county which he had acquired in 1647 by some transaction in Delinquents' Estates; and, when the business was appealed to the Haberdashers' Hall Committee in London, the judgment there, given in 1651, was still adverse. Lilburne's old enemy Sir Arthur Hasilrig having been chairman of the Durham Committee, the judgment was attributed by the Lilburnes to his malice; and in a pamphlet entitled *A Just Reproof to Haberdashers' Hall*, published by Lilburne in his uncle's behalf, July 1651, there was the most virulent defamation both of Hasilrig and of the London Committee. "Unjust and unworthy men," they were called, "fit to be spewed out of all human society, and deserving worse than to be hanged." No notice was taken of this libel or of one or two others that followed; but on the 23rd of December, 1651, Parliament was roused to action by a petition presented to itself. This Petition was nominally by a Josiah Primate, leather-seller, who came forward as the person principally interested in the Durham property; but Lilburne was the real promoter, and he had distributed printed copies of the Petition freely about London. It accused Hasilrig of violence and fraud, and the Haberdashers' Hall Committee of fraudulent collusion with him. A committee of investigation was at once appointed; Primate, Lilburne, and other witnesses, with relative documents, were examined: and on the 15th of January 1651–2 the case was ripe for the decision of the House. They declared the Petition "false, malicious, and scandalous," and the printing and dispersing of it "a high breach of Privilege of Parliament"; they ordered it to be burnt by the hands of the hangman; and they resolved that Primate should pay a fine of £3000 to the State, £2000 to Sir Arthur Hasilrig, and £500 to each of the four members of the Haberdashers' Hall Committee that had been chiefly libelled, and should be imprisoned in the Fleet till the fines should be paid, and that Lilburne should pay the like fines, and be banished moreover out of the Commonwealth, with prohibition of return under the pain of death. The sentences were pronounced by the House on the 20th, Primate receiving his meekly, but Lilburne, as usual, obstinately refusing to kneel at the bar; and on the 30th Lilburne's banishment for life was confirmed by a formal Act. Both the rigour of the sentence on Lilburne, and the boldness of the House in acting as the judicial tribunal in his case, have been severely censured by modern constitutionalists. In fact, however, Lilburne's offence, though in appearance only a defamation of individuals, was essentially a defamation of the Commonwealth. He had given the government an opportunity to get rid of the most turbulent blockhead of an honest and popular kind living in that generation; and the government had used it. The fines were but ostensible parts of the sentences. Primate's fine to the State was remitted, and Primate himself released from the Fleet, within three months (April 7, 1652); by which time Lilburne, his fines unpaid, was walking disconsolately somewhere on the continent, incapable of farther mischief. Just when England lost one of her celebrities in this way, she recovered another. On the

---

[1] Ludlow, 282—283; Whitlocke, Dec. 8, 1651; Council of State Order Book, same day; Commons Journals, Dec. 9 and 18.

27th of November, 1651, Parliament had pardoned the poet Waller for his old treason of Nov. 1644, and given him leave to return from his exile.[1]

Ireton's death and the banishment of John Lilburne being recollected as isolated events of the beginning of the Fourth year of the Commonwealth, the history of the Commonwealth otherwise through that year, and as far as to April 1653, flows on steadily in the channel cleared for it by the Battle of Worcester. Charles II. and his cause had been swept from the face of the British Islands, as it might seem, for ever; and the government, with a consciousness of stability which it had never before possessed, could proceed at leisure to whatever farther work lay before it. Still, as before, it is in the Parliament and the Council of State that we see the government lodged; and still, as before, the Parliament is that curious historical anomaly called *The Rump,* consisting of the surviving or persevering shred of what had once been a large representative assembly. On such an extreme occasion as the annual ballot for a new Council of State, as we have seen, as many as 120 or 125 persons could show themselves in the House; but practically, during the seventeen months on which we have now entered, the attendance, as proved by the recorded divisions, ranged from thirty-six to ninty-seven, rising more frequently to seventy or eighty in the course of 1652 than in the three preceding years, though often dwindling again to fifty or lower. Between this anomalous Parliament and its Council of State, each body maintaining within itself the customary sub-agency of committees, all business passed and repassed as before. Not the less, all through the seventeen months, are we aware of a certain personal presence and influence at the back of both Parliament and Council, and felt uneasily by both of them. No longer away in Ireland or in Scotland, but back permanently in London, with all his battles fought and his mind free for state-affairs, "The Lord-General," as he was called, was an authority by himself. As he walked about Whitehall or in the Park, sometimes still in the military dress which befitted his title, but oftener now a portly civilian figure, in a plain black suit and grey worsted stockings, all heads were turned to look at him; when he did take his seat in the House or at the Council Board there was a flutter of deference in receiving him and in listening to him; and, when he was absent, it was still as if he had been present. He was always named on every important Committee; and very often a matter of difficulty was referred expressly to his judgment. Still, in a manner, he stood aloof. He was Lord General Cromwell, the commander-in-chief of all the forces of the Commonwealth, a vast independent power overshadowing and observing the government, rather than strictly contained by it. His observations were in time to end in violent interference; meanwhile in all the main proceedings of the Commonwealth from Dec. 1651 to April 1653 Cromwell and the government go heartily together.[1]

---

[1] Commons Journals of the dates given; and Godwin's Commonwealth, III. 333—339.

First may be mentioned the measures taken for the incorporation of Scotland with the Commonwealth.

Five of the eight Commissioners appointed for this business, Oct. 23, 1651, viz. St. John, Vane, Colonel Fenwick, Mr. Salway, and Alderman Tichbourne, had only been waiting for their Instructions, that they might set out for Scotland and join Generals Monk, Lambert, and Dean, who were there already preparing the ground. The Instructions, having been carefully debated, were finally agreed to on the 11th of December, when they were handed to the Commissioners with the strictest precautions for secrecy. In January 1651–2, accordingly, all the eight Commissioners were in Scotland. Through that month and the whole of February they were busy in various ways, both public and private; but the climax of their proceedings was on the 23rd of February, when they held at Dalkeith a kind of Parliament of Scotsmen that had been summoned for the purpose, consisting of Commissioners from all the Scottish shires and boroughs that cared to be represented. To this assembly of representative Scotchmen they submitted what was called *The Tender*,

---

[1] Commons Journals from Dec. 1651 to April 1653, for records of divisions and mentions of Cromwell; Council of State Order Books for same period.

i. e. the offer of the English Parliament to incorporate England and Scotland into one Commonwealth.[1]

It was a hard question for Scotland. That the ancient little land should assent to the extinction of her nationality was a thought from which thousands recoiled. The clergy especially were loud in their resistance. That body, however, was so racked at this time by dissensions within itself that the resistance took different forms. The dispute between the *Resolutioners* and the *Protesters* or *Remonstrants* had been raging more fiercely than ever since the battle of Worcester; and in meetings of Presbyteries and Synods, and in such larger clerical conclaves as Monk and Lambert had recently permitted, the prospect of an incorporation with England had been discussed, in connexion with that dispute, till both parties had split themselves farther in their very attempts to unite patriotically. The more Royalist section of the Resolutioners still boldly prayed for Charles II. in their pulpits, and opposed incorporation with England as a treachery at once to him, to monarchical government, and to the Covenant and Scottish Presbytery. Others there were who, with less affection for Charles II. or the Stuart dynasty, stood out at least for monarchical Government and Presbytery, as essential for Scotland, and therefore could not but oppose incorporation with a Republic governed by Independents and Sectaries. Beyond these there was a third party, including some of the most conspicuous Protesters, willing enough to repudiate monarchy altogether, as they had already repudiated Charles II. personally, but anxious, if possible, to conserve the separate Scottish nationality, with pure and absolute Presbytery, and proposing therefore to obtain, through Cromwell, the consent of the English Commonwealth to the erection of Scotland into a distinct and self-governed, though allied, Republic. This last clerical party, it is evident, was the most manageable by the English, and the likeliest to yield. And circumstances were such as to give neither them, nor the monarchists among the clergy, any option. Popular opinion in Scotland, no longer under the control of the clergy, had declared itself pretty largely in favour of a union with the English. There was the strong argument of necessity. The English, though one might call them derisively "the usurping brethren," had certainly conquered Scotland; they had Scotland completely at their mercy; why contend against the inevitable? Moreover, the experience which the Scots had now for some time had of English rule had greatly abated prejudices. Never had Edinburgh and Leith been so well cleansed and lighted, or so well policed generally, as since they had been garrisoned by Cromwell's soldiers; and the inhabitants of both towns were obliged to confess that, since the Town-Councils of both had been in abeyance, and all petitions and complaints had been addressed to the English military governors, these functionaries had "proceeded more equitably and conscientiously in justice nor our awn Scottish magistrates." It was the same all over the country. The case of Sir Alexander Irvine of Drum in Aberdeenshire is a typical one. He was a Royalist of the Royalists, had been an indomitable Scottish Prelatist all through the reign of the Covenant, and latterly had adhered to Montrose; he had suffered fines and damages past reckoning for his obstinate Malignancy: there was no man in Scotland whose antecedents gave him less reason to expect favour from the English invaders. Yet, at this very moment (Jan. 1651–2), what had the Laird of Drum done? In the agony of a new quarrel with the kirk-authorities of his neighbourhood, as represented in the Presbytery of Aberdeen, and threatened by those authorities with fresh penalties and persecution, he had challenged their jurisdiction, and appealed for protection, first to Colonel Overton, the English commander of the district, and then to General Monk himself. The case was to last for some months, the Aberdeen Presbytery inflicting or threatening excommunication, but the Laird holding his ground bravely, and not only assured of the protection he had demanded for himself, but with the satisfaction also of having drawn from Monk a public order, proclaimed at Aberdeen, forbidding kirk-officers to impose any oath or covenant upon any person without the sanction of the

---

[1] Commons Journals of dates, and Life of Robert Blair (Wodrow Society), pp. 293—4.

Commonwealth, and so in fact "relieving those who were oppressed in their consciences by the Presbyteries." Little wonder that the old Royalists throughout Scotland, despairing now utterly of Charles II., and having to choose between a Scotland to be governed as heretofore by native Presbytery and a Scotland to be fused into England, preferred the latter as the less evil. Accordingly, it was the cry of the anti-Unionists that among the chief favourers of the Union were the old Malignants. At the other extreme, however, also reconciled to the Union by the welcome prospect of relief from Presbyterian oppression, were the now pretty numerous Scottish sectaries and democrats. Baptists, Antinomians, Seekers, even Anti-Trinitarians, and Anti-Sabbatarians, had multiplied in the South of Scotland round about the English military stations; congregations of Independents were struggling into existence in the North; there were many Scots who now repudiated the Covenant, and had become zealots for Liberty of Conscience, and theological and political progress. All in all, though not without a wrench to the old Scottish national sentiment, and not without some rueful quotation of the saying of Mr. Blair, minister of St. Andrews, "As for the embodying of Scotland with England, it will be as when the poor bird is embodied into the hawk that hath eaten it up," a very considerable proportion of the laity was ready to acquiesce. The notion of the erection of Scotland into a separate and allied little Republic had obtained so little hearing, that Johnston of Warriston, Mr. Patrick Gillespie, and others, who had favoured that notion, had to join practically with the Unionists.[1]

The result of the conference at Dalkeith was that on March 16, 1651–2, two of the Commissioners, Vane and Fenwick, were back in London with a very satisfactory report to Parliament. Twenty out of the thirty-two shires of Scotland had assented generally, through their Deputies, to the incorporating Union; about thirty-five burghs, including Edinburgh, Aberdeen, Dundee, Stirling, Perth, Arbroath, Montrose, Lanark, Burntisland, and Cupar, had likewise assented; and the only distinct dissent reported was from the city of Glasgow.[1] With thanks to the Commissioners for their success, the House then proceeded with the business in conjunction with the Council of State; and on the 13th of April, 1652, several additional assents having meanwhile been received from Scotland, with that of Glasgow at last, an "Act for the incorporating of Scotland into one Commonwealth and Free State with England, and for abolishing the Kingly office in Scotland," passed the first and second readings.[2] Details had yet to be settled and the Incorporation formally consummated; but from that moment it was declared and virtually complete."

---

[1] Life of Robert Blair, pp. 289—294; Baillie's Letters, III. 173 et seq.; Whitlocke, III. 385 et seq.; Mercurius Politicus, No. 86 (Jan. 22—29, 1851—2); Chambers's Domestic Annals of Scotland, II. 209—213.

An important step had already been taken by the nomination of four English lawyers — Messrs. Andrew Owen, George Smith, John Marsh, and Edward Moseley—to go into Scotland, as resident Judges for the Commonwealth, and to aid the Commissioners in reorganizing the Scottish judicial and administrative system. Their arrival, by all accounts, began a new era in Scottish experience. "The English "Judges here have sat now these twelve days for the administration of justice," writes the Edinburgh correspondent of the *Mercurius Politicus* of June 10–17: "justice was wont to "be open and free for none formerly but great men, but now "it flows equally to all; which will in a short time make "them sensible from what bondage they are delivered." The Scottish lawyers, he goes on to say, had all, with the exception of three or four, refused to subscribe to the Tender of Union, and therefore stood incapable of pleading before the new Judges; whose difficulties were farther increased by the perseverance of the clergy in "preaching damnation" to all who accepted the Union. Nevertheless, a good beginning had been made; and, most of the English Commissioners, Lambert and Monk included, having returned to London, it was felt that Scotland might be left safely enough meanwhile to the civil administration of the new Judges and their assistants, and to the military control of the English army of occupation, with Major-General Dean for its chief. For the Judges and their assistants there was to be a circuit through the country, not only for the purpose of holding courts, but also for the visitation of the Universities. For the army there was now little or nothing to do. The last relics of the old Scottish army under Lord Balcarras had capitulated to Colonel Lilburne at Elgin in Dec. 1651; Dumbarton Castle, Brodick Castle, Bass Island, and Dunnottar Castle, had surrendered since. All that was now necessary was a somewhat troublesome raid by Dean and Overton into the Western Highlands (July 1652), with a view of intimidating hostile elements there and spreading the knowledge of the Tender, and also, if possible, of coming to an understanding with the Marquis of Argyle. That nobleman had not been able to make up his mind, but had been "shuffling and cutting," the contemporary newsmen said, between the Unionists and the Anti-Unionists, now corresponding with the English and holding them "in suspense with overtures," and again studying subtle possibilities of a contrary kind among his Celtic vassals and the Presbyterian clergy. That also was to have an end. The Marquis, surprised by Dean at last, had to make his peace with the ruling powers. And so, twenty-one Scottish Commissioners (fourteen for the shires and seven for the burghs) having been elected at Edinburgh in August, and having gone to London by appointment, there to prosecute at more leisure the rest of the business of the Incorporation, with the question of the proportion of representatives to be accorded to Scotland in the future Parliaments of the Commonwealth, the little land itself lay in compulsory repose. An English army of 7000 or 8000 men, judiciously distributed between the Borders and the Orkneys, with Edinburgh, Perth, Ayr, and Inverness as their chief stations, had superseded the old Scottish sovereignty. Even the Records of the country had been carried away, in great part, to England. Only the supreme symbols of the old nationality had escaped capture.

---

[1] Commons Journals of March 16, 1651—2; where, however, the names of the Scottish shires and burghs are shockingly jumbled and misspelt. Of the twelve shires that had made no appearance most dropped in afterwards.

[2] Commons Journals of date given, and also of March 26, 1652.

The Regalia of Scotland, consisting of the crown, sceptre, and sword of State, had been deposited for safety in Dunnottar Castle, a strong sea-washed rock-fortress on the Eastern coast, and actually the last place that had surrendered to the English (May 1652). They were then sought for in vain. During the siege they had been removed, by a clever stratagem of Mrs. Christian Grainger, wife of the minister of Kinneff, in connivance with Mrs. Ogilvie of Barra, wife of the governor of the Castle. Only four persons knew what had become of them. It was given out that they had been conveyed to Charles II. abroad; but actually they were lying, in rough linen wrappages, in a hole under the boards of the pulpit of Kinneff church, where every Sunday Mr. Grainger stood up over them, praying fervently, as most of his brethren did, for the exiled king.[1]

Our glance at Ireland may be equally brief. After Ireton's death, the management of Irish affairs for the Commonwealth remained in the hands of Ludlow, assisted by Lord Broghill, Sir Charles Coote, Commissary General Reynolds, Sir Hardress Waller, and others. On the 30th of January, 1651–2, however, Parliament appointed Lambert to succeed Ireton in his office, i. e. in that of Lord Deputy of Ireland under Cromwell's Lord-Lieutenancy. Cromwell, who had really made the appointment, was required to give Lambert the necessary powers; and letters were sent to Scotland, where Lambert then was, recalling him to London. He had returned, and had made his preparations for going to Ireland, when a difficulty occurred, as to the nature and cause of which there are various legends. Lambert's wife, says the popular story, meeting Ireton's young widow (Cromwell's daughter) dressed in her mourning in St. James's Park, offended her by claiming precedence, on the ground that an actual Lady-Deputy is superior to an ex-Lady-Deputy; Lieutenant-General Fleetwood, then a widower and also in mourning, chanced to be present, and showed great sympathy with the widow in her distress; and Cromwell, perceiving the state of matters, managed accordingly. The facts seem to be that Lambert had accepted the office on the understanding that it was to continue to be the Lord-Deputyship as in Ireton's time, but that, objections having been made in Parliament to a renewal of the Lord-Lieutenancy as incongruous with Republican institutions, and a majority of thirty-nine to thirty-seven having voted that it should not be renewed (May 19), and the Lord-Deputyship necessarily ceasing with the Lord-Lieutenancy, Lambert did not think it worth his while to accept the diminished dignity which was then all he could have: viz. the Commandership-in-chief of the forces in Ireland by commission from Lord General Cromwell, with one of the Commissionerships for Irish civil affairs besides. Certain it is that he resigned, in no good humour with Parliament, but perfectly satisfied with Cromwell's conduct, and that on the 9th of July, on the recommendation of Cromwell and the Council of State, Parliament appointed Fleetwood to the post which Lambert had declined. In August Fleetwood went over to Ireland, having previously married Ireton's widow, and so become Cromwell's son-in-law as well as his military deputy.

---

[1] Merc. Pol., No. 100, and No. 106; Order Books of Council of State, April 6, 1652; Commons Journals of various dates through 1652; Balfour's Annals, IV. 350; Life of Robert Blair, 298—301; Whitlocke, III. 426, 443, 451, et seq.; Letter of Sir Walter Scott in Lockhart's Life, p. 360 of one-vol. ed.; Chambers's Domestic Annals of Scotland, II. 213—215.

When he arrived, the last relics of the long and bloody war had been extinguished, and he had merely to cooperate with Ludlow and the other Civil Commisioners in the multifarious business already going on under the vague name of A Settlement of Ireland. What that included may be gathered from an abridged note of the proceedings of Parliament on the 20th of April, 1652. On that day the House, having under their consideration the whole state of Ireland, in connexion with a petition which had been sent in by the Adventurers in Irish lands—i. e. by those who had subscribed to the loans for the Irish war in the faith of repayment out of the millions of Irish acres that were to be confiscated—passed the following Resolutions: "That it be referred to the Council of State to "consider of the propositions of the Adventurers for Ireland "and of the Act for their security, and prepare something for "the judgment of the Parliament for the settling of the affairs "of Ireland"; "That it be referred to the Council of State, "and they be empowered, to give way to the transporting out "of Ireland into foreign parts such of the Irish as they shall "think fit, for the advantage of the Commonwealth"; also, "That they do make provision for the transporting of persons "from one part of the nation to another, as shall be most for "the benefit and advantage of this Commonwealth"; finally, "That it be referred to the Council of State to consider how "the soldiers that have been or shall be disbanded in Ireland, "and those officers there for whom there hath no provision "been made here, may have reasonable satisfaction given to "them in Ireland for their service." Out of these references to the Council of State and farther discussions in Parliament there emerged two great measures. The first, which became law Aug. 12, was entitled "An Act for the Settling of Ireland," but might rather have been named "An Act for proportioning the penalties of those who have been concerned in the Irish Rebellion and for rating the confiscation of their lands." About a hundred named persons, the Marquis of Ormond first, the Marquis of Clanricarde and other Irish Peers following, were totally excepted from pardon, as were also all who should be found to have been directly implicated in the original Massacre of 1643. The lands of all persons in this double category were, of course, totally forfeited. Next came all who had served as officers in the Catholic armies, with others of about coequal guilt. They were to be mulcted of two-thirds of their estates, and the officers at least to be transported into foreign parts. Lastly, all Catholics of means, except those who had merited special favour, were to forfeit one third of their estates, only such as had no means, or means not worth taking into account, to be freely forgiven. How was the enormous amount of Irish property so confiscated to be applied and distributed? That was the subject of another great Bill, introduced Aug. 5, 1652, under the title of "An Act for the speedy and effectual Satisfaction of the Adventurers for Lands in Ireland, and of the arrears due to the soldiery, and for the encouragement of Protestants to plant and inhabit in Ireland." For the two first-named objects, namely the satisfaction of the State-creditors in the Irish loan and the recompense of the English soldiery in Ireland, there were to be set apart, in equal portions, all the forfeited lands in three specified counties in Munster, four in Leinster, and three in Ulster; and all the rest of the forfeited lands in the same three provinces were to be applied (1) in making good any deficiency that might remain for those purposes, (2) in discharging other Irish debts of whatever kind, and (3) as a residue, part of which was to remain the property of the Parliament, while the rest was to be used for such public objects as road-making, bridge-making, and the setting up of schools, churches, and manufactures, or to be sold or leased to approved Protestant settlers from England or Scotland. The intention evidently was to Protestantise, as far as possible, those three Provinces of Ireland; and, accordingly, it was farther provided that the fourth Province, Connaught, should be reserved as the specially Catholic region, to which, at the discretion of the authorities of the Commonwealth, Catholic families might be removed from the other three Provinces, receiving equivalents in lands there for the lands they had quitted. A measure so tremendous and complex could not be passed on a sudden; and, accordingly, though introduced in August 1652, and read the second time on the 6th of that month, it was still in debate in April 1653.

Nevertheless, the Council of State, and Fleetwood and the other Commissioners in Ireland, were already, with the powers they had, acting in the spirit of the measure. Ireland, bruised and crushed, all her Catholic chiefs and men of military rank expatriated, and the work of the hangman over save for such unpardonable wretches of the original Massacre as might still be hunted out, lay at last in profound peace. No less than Scotland, she was now beginning, it seemed, a new era of her history. But in what different conditions! The Presbyterianism of Scotland, stubborn as it was, had guarantees of toleration in all points except those in which it was itself intolerant; and it might be expected at last to melt into a general Protestantism of Great Britain, comprising many varieties. Ireland, on the other hand, was overwhelmingly Roman Catholic. Could all the Roman Catholicism of Ireland be ever possibly packed up in Connaught; and, whether it could, or whether it must remain also to some extent permeating the other three Provinces, what were to be its rights? The ultimate Protestantising of Ireland, we have said, was certainly the great aim of the Commonwealth, and its chief hope through all its proceedings connected with the settlement. Towards this much might be done by fresh plantations of English and Scottish Protestants in the forfeited lands; but that propangandism among the native Irish was not to be neglected appears from the following minute of the Council of State, July 29, 1652, just after Fleetwood had been appointed to the Command-in-chief in Ireland:—"That Mr. Sidrach Simpson, Mr. Owen, Mr. "Caryl, Mr. Strong, Mr. Lockyer, Mr. Brooks, Mr. Thomas "Goodwin, Mr. Knight, and Mr. Peters, be desired to meet "on Tuesday next, at three of the clock in the afternoon, at "the Lord General's [Cromwell's] house, at the Cockpit, with "Lieutenant-General Fleetwood, Colonel Hewson, and some "other officers of Ireland, to confer and advise with them "about providing some able and godly persons to go into "Ireland to preach the Gospel." Such persons did afterwards go to Ireland in Fleetwood's train. But how about the toleration of the Roman Catholic Religion for such of the Irish as would not be converted? That question had been discussed in Parliament on the 1st of June, with very interesting results. By a bare majority of thirty-five to twenty-eight it was carried that the Commissioners for Ireland should declare "That it is their intention, and the intention of their "ministers, not to compel any of the Recusants in this nation "[Ireland] to their worship or divine service contrary to their "conscience." Vane and Henry Marten were the tellers for the majority in this vote, while Skippon and Sir William Masham were tellers for the Noes; and it shows what a relapse there had been on the Toleration question, at least as regarded Ireland, that the Tolerationists of the House were obliged to let this Proviso be added without a division:

" Provided that this doth not extend to the allowance of the " exercise of the Popish Religion in Ireland, nor to give any " colour or countenance thereunto, nor to the least toleration " thereof." In other words, the Catholic Irish were not to be compelled to profess themselves Protestants, but the public exercise of their own Religion was not to be allowed by the State. It is difficult to see how such a rule could work. Probably it was only a sturdy theoretical assertion of the Protestantism of the Commonwealth, not intended to be enforced to the letter, but to be relaxed in the administration, especially when the Irish Catholics should be all cooped up in Connaught.[1]

Of the foreign relations of the Commonwealth through 1652 and part of 1653 by far the most important were those with the Dutch Republic. On the 19th of December, 1651, there had been a most ceremonious reception by the Parliament of the three ambassadors that had been sent by " the High and Mighty Lords, the States-General of the United Provinces," to remonstrate against St. John's recent Navigation Act, and to resume, if possible, the treaty between the two nations which had been so unfortunately broken off at the Hague in the preceding June. The three ambassadors were JACOBUS CATZ, late Pensionary of the United Provinces, GERARD SCHAEP, already so well known and so popular in England, and PAULUS VANDE PERRE, Pensionary of Middleburg. They came with every desire to conciliate. The leaders of the Commonwealth, however, could not forget the coolness with which, only a few months before, the States-General had declined the still larger proposals of alliance made to them, and could not but attribute the change of Dutch policy to the fact that the Commonwealth after Worcester was a far more formidable thing in the calculations of the general world than the Commonwealth before Worcester. Accordingly, though the ambassadors were encircled with the most studied demonstrations of respect, and entertained at dinner again and again, there was no hurry to close with them, and it was left to the Council of State to consider their papers and proposals in detail.

---

[1] Commons Journals of dates given and others ; Order Books of Council of State, July 29, 1652 ; Ludlow's Memoirs, 383—430 ; Godwin, III. 320—332.

Meanwhile in both countries there were irritations that imperilled the result. Besides passing the Navigation Act, the English Government had issued letters of marque to various merchants; the Dutch had adopted measures of reprisal; captured Dutch vessels and property had been brought into English ports; wherever in the seas the English and Dutch flags met, there was fighting, sailorly bullying in both languages, or at least sulky humour and international rancour. Matters had come to such a pass that the sea-faring parts of the populace in both countries were angry at their governments for negotiating at all, and eager for a war. Were not the Dutch the first naval power in the world, and able to sweep the English from the seas in a month, and embargo their whole Island? To such patriotic swaggering in the Dutch ports there was ample retort along the Thames, and elsewhere on the coasts of England. Did the Dutch lubbers imagine that England was still under a King James or a King Charles? Let there be but one or two good fights with the best Dutchmen afloat, and it would be seen whether the England of the Commonwealth need be less the mistress of the seas than the old England of Queen Bess, or need yield, in tar, oakum, and broadsides, even to the Dutch.

May 1652 had arrived, and all was yet unsettled, when a huge accident occurred. Though the States-General collectively were anxious for peace, there was a considerable war-party among the higher Dutch politicians of the Orange faction; Vice-Admiral Van Tromp was one of these; by his influence at the Dutch Admiralty orders had been issued in February for the fitting out of a fleet of 150 sail in case of contingencies; and meanwhile what should prevent Van Tromp himself, with forty-two ships, from having a look at the English coasts? Driven by stress of weather, as the Dutch afterwards explained, or from some whim of his own, he did appear, on the 19th of May, in the Downs, off Dover. By good luck or ill luck, Blake had contrived to be thereabouts too; and, though he had but twenty-three ships, he put himself sturdily in Van Tromp's way. A point of naval etiquette included in the English claims was that foreign ships in the narrow seas should lower their flags to the English; and Blake signalled to Van Tromp for this courtesy. Van Tromp positively declined; and, as Blake dogged him and persisted, he veered round, and sent a broadside into Blake's flag-ship. "Not very civil in Brother Tromp to break my windows," said Blake, and opened back, with all his might, on the Dutchman. For four hours there was an irregular fight, the ships of the two Admirals conspicuous throughout. Night came on, and in the morning Van Tromp was not to be seen. He had made sail for Holland. One Dutch ship had been taken and one sunk, while Blake's loss consisted of forty-one men killed or wounded, and seventy shot-holes in the hull or rigging of his own vessel.[1]

How seriously this affair was taken in England is shown by the fact that the Council of State held a special meeting on Sunday, May 23, after the receipt of the news. At that meeting, and at subsequent meetings both of the Council and of Parliament, there were the most vigorous orders for war-preparations, with letters to Blake of the kind he liked. The States-General, however, hastened to repair Van Tromp's blunder, by immediately despatching to London a fourth Ambassador Extraordinary, to offer apologies and explanations, and to assist the other three in pushing on the Treaty. This was ADRIAN PAUW, Grand Pensionary of Holland, who had formerly been in England as the chief of the Dutch embassy sent to plead for the life of Charles I., and had then won himself very high opinions. Nothing could exceed the pomp and courtesy with which Lord Pauw, as he was called, was received by the Parliament on the 11th of June; but, in the arduous negotiation which followed with the Council of State from day to day, even he broke down. The chiefs of the Commonwealth were in their proudest mood. Promise of an investigation into Van Tromp's conduct, and of due salute of the English flag in future, was nothing; other concessions that Pauw had been empowered to make were nothing; the Parliament and the Council of State had gone back upon the business of the murder of Dorislaus, the whole course of the Dutch conduct in the matter of Charles II., and other grievances on record by the English against the Dutch, as far as the famous "Amboyna massacre" of 1622. They presented to the astonished Pauw a Latin bill, in which the items of damages sustained by the English from the Dutch long ago at various places in the East and West Indies amounted to a total of £1,681,816 15*s.*, with an estimate of the arrears of interest at more than as much again; and they demanded payment of these old damages, or security for payment, as a condition of farther treaty on present grounds. Pauw could only suggest that there might be a counter-bill by the Dutch against the English, and that a balance would have to be struck. On the 30th of June he and his colleagues took their ceremonious and regretful leave; and on the 7th of July the Parliament adopted a Declaration of the Causes of War against the Dutch, which had been elaborately prepared by the Council of State, and ordered the same to be printed and published, and translated into Dutch, French, and Latin. On the 11th of July, in the urgency of the crisis, there were two more Sunday meetings of the Council, with letters to Blake; and, before the end of the month, the States-General having accepted the challenge and issued *their* manifesto, the two nations were at war.

---

[1] Commons Journals, Dec. 19, 25, 1651, Jan. 6, 7, 1651—2, and various subsequent days; various entries in the Council Order Books from Dec. 1651 to May 1652; Thurloe, I. 201—206; Godwin's *Commonwealth*, III. 383—387; Guizot's *Cromwell and the Commonwealth*, I. 274—279.

What months followed! Wherever at sea Englishmen and Dutchmen met, whether in the Channel, or along the British coasts of the North Sea as far as the Shetlands, or in the Baltic, or along the Atlantic coasts, or in the Mediterranean itself, there was mutual defiance, with fighting and prize-taking. The main warfare was in the Channel and the North Sea. At first the dependence of the Dutch was still on Van Tromp, while the English trusted to Blake, aided by Sir George Ayscough, a brave officer just returned from the

---

[1] Commons Journals of dates given and of various dates intervening; entries, of dates given and others, in Council Order Books; Godwin, III. 387—392. The Latin Bill of Damages against the Dutch will be found among Milton's State Letters (Pickering's Edition of Milton's Works, VII. 234—237).

West Indies. Blake was away among the Orkneys and Shetlands, making havoc among the Dutch fishing-vessels there and the Dutch men-of-war protecting them; Ayscough guarded the Channel. Van Tromp tried Ayscough separately in the Channel, and then Blake separately among the Orkneys and Shetlands; but, what with calms, what with storms, what with the vigilance of both the English Admirals, with no sort of success in either case. He had to return to Holland with a battered squadron, vastly reduced by wreckage; and, as there had been losses of Dutch East-India ships and of whole fleets of Dutch herring-busses in addition, and Blake had pursued Van Tromp and was ravaging among the shipping off the Dutch coasts themselves, the Dutch were in despair. Their brave Van Tromp, in disgrace for the time, was superseded by De Ruyter, another of their famous Admirals. A drawn battle with Ayscough off Plymouth on the 16th of August is all that marks De Ruyter's term of individual command. For the Dutch had equipped a new fleet under their statesman-Admiral De Witt; and De Witt, joining De Ruyter, took the supreme place. On the 28th of September there was a battle on the Kentish coast between De Witt's fleet, numbering sixty-four ships of war, and Blake's, numbering sixty-eight. It was a valiant battle on both sides, remembered as "The Fight of Kentish Knock," and was not quite decisive on first appearances, but was turned into a triumph for the English the next day, when De Witt and De Ruyter, who would fain have renewed the fight, found themselves obliged to make back for Holland, with Blake in pursuit. Again, in sore straits, the States-General changed their Commander-in-chief. They recalled Van Tromp as their ablest seaman after all, and gave him De Ruyter and others of their best for his assistants. The English Parliament also, though Blake was undoubtedly their naval hero, and he had fit seconds in Ayscough, Penn, and Lawson, thought it as well to revert to a former resolution of theirs that there should be "three Generals for governing the Fleet and Fleets at sea," and summoned Lieutenant-General Monk and Major-General Dean from Scotland, to be associated with Blake in that capacity, and convert their soldiership into sea-service, just as he had done, as long as there might be need. But, before Monk and Dean had received the summons, Blake, the most Nelson-like of English Admirals before Nelson, encountered Van Tromp again all by himself. With but thirty-seven ships he engaged Van Tromp's fleet of seventy-three in the Channel, on the 29th of November, and fought with it the whole day, his own ship always in the thickest fire, from forenoon till night. Not successfully, however. Two of the English ships had been taken; Blake's ship, brought off a mere hull after having been twice boarded, had to seek shelter in English harbours with the rest of his battered ships; and Van Tromp, in signal that he now swept the Channel, cruised about it with a broom at his mast-head. Some of Blake's captains had behaved with much "baseness of spirit" in the affair, and others not so well as he had expected; and the modest man, while complaining of this in letters to the Council of State, and suggesting that there should be a searching inquiry into the facts, begged that he himself might be discharged from an "employment far too great" for him. There *was* an inquiry, followed by arrests and discharges of some of Blake's officers, including a younger brother of his own; but Blake was retained in command with honour. His opportunity then came. With a refitted and enlarged fleet, on board of which were now Dean and Monk, besides Penn and Lawson, he watched eagerly for Van Tromp, and fell upon him at last, commanding a fleet of about equal force, but with a great convoy of merchantmen, off Portland Bill on the Dorset coast. For three consecutive days the battle raged, Van Tromp tugging Blake hither and thither on the chance of putting his merchantmen in safety, but Blake holding his grip like a bull-dog till he saw disaster amid the Dutch. Seventeen or eighteen Dutch ships of war taken with their crews, thirty merchantmen taken, besides what had been destroyed — such was the measure of this great victory of Feb. 18–20, 1652–3, the news of which sent London and all England into a commotion of joy, not ended even on the 12th of April, when there was a solemn thanksgiving by order of Parliament. That is about our boundary of time for the present, and the war with the Dutch was not yet over. Seven months of it, however, had renewed universally among the English the old Elizabethan feeling that they were the real lords of the salt water ; and the same seven months had brought Robert Blake more to the front than ever as one of the men of the Commonwealth. He was then fifty-four years of age, a year older than Cromwell. He had been a member of the fourth Council of State, but had not been re-elected to the fifth, which was in its third month of office at the date of his last victory.[1]

Before the war with the Dutch had begun, and while the Dutch were still negotiating through their ambassadors for an alliance with the power of whose stability and strength the Battle of Worcester and the Navigation Act had convinced them too late, there had, for similar reasons, been a concourse to London of agents from other foreign powers that had stood aloof hitherto. The events of the war itself rather increased than lessened this sense throughout Europe of the necessity of diplomatic relations of some sort with the English Commonwealth. Hence, by April 1653, there were more foreign ministers and agents about Whitehall than one can well count. The following is a digest of whatever of interest I have been able to collect on this subject, with the names of the foreign diplomatists where I have ascertained them. It is to be remembered that this was peculiarly Milton's department of affairs, and that the foreigners to be named, with others that have been named already, were persons with whom he had to come into contact officially :—

SWEDEN :—On the 19th of December, 1651, the very day of the ceremonious reception by the House of the three Ambassadors from the United Provinces, it was announced that a public minister from the Queen of Sweden had arrived on the English shores. He turned out to be a PETER SPIERING SILVERCRON ; and, on the 23rd of January, 1651–2, his credential letters having been read in the House, and found in due form, the business of negotiating with him was referred to the Council of State. The poor man died, however, February 9, before the business had well begun. There was much condolence on the mishap; and, return-letters to Queen Christina having been carefully prepared, a special messenger, Mr. Daniel (David?) Lisle, was despatched with them to Stockholm. The consequence was that there arrived, May 4, 1652, another regularly-accredited minister from her Swedish Majesty, HAROLD APPLEBOOM. He resided in London for some time, and there was a good deal of intercourse on commercial and other matters between him and the Council of State, leading to exchanges of letters between the Parliament and Queen Christina. Her dispositions towards the Commonwealth seemed so friendly that it was at length resolved (December 23, 1652) to send an English Ambassador to her Court. Viscount Lisle, who had been three times a member of the Council of State and had just ceased to belong to that body, was chosen for the purpose, December 31. His instructions, however, were not ready till March 22, 1652–3, and even then his departure was delayed. Meanwhile Appleboom, whose proper station was the Hague, had returned thither, and in his place as Swedish Residents in London there had arrived first a M. BENJAMIN BONNEL (February 22, 1652–3) and next ISRAEL LAGERFELDT (April 7, 1653). This last had come, more particularly, with offers from Queen Christina to mediate between the English and the Dutch.[1]

---

[1] Godwin, III. 394—399 and 439—445 ; Guizot, I. 282—289 ; Dixon's Life of Blake (ed. 1856), p. 5 and pp. 164—203 ; Whitlocke, Oct. 5, 1652, Dec. 1652, and Feb. 1652—3 ; Commons Journals, Nov. 26, 1652, and March 15, 1652—3.

DENMARK:—An agent from King Frederick III. of Denmark and Norway delivered his credentials, March 12, 1651–2, and was referred to the Council of State. His name is the less important because, some weeks afterwards, two Ambassadors-Extraordinary arrived in London with ample powers from his Danish Majesty: viz. ERIC ROSENCRANTZ and PETER REETZ. They were received by the House, May 26, 1652, with all that higher state which was accorded to full Ambassadors; and for several months there were interviews and papers in Latin between them and the Council of State. Gradually, however, after the war with the Dutch had begun, difficulties arose, the interests of Denmark inclining his Danish Majesty to the side of the Dutch. There were even complaints against his Majesty for detention of English ships at Copenhagen, &c. In short Denmark and the Commonwealth could not yet be quite in accord; and, on the 29th of October, 1652, the two Ambassadors had their formal audience of leave. In April 1653 the relations with Denmark were still unsettled.[2]

HAMBURG, LUBECK, BREMEN, AND OTHER HANSE TOWNS:—On the 25th of February, 1651–2, letters of credence were read in the House from the Burgomasters and Senators of Hamburg, Lubeck, and Bremen, "for themselves and the rest of the Hanse towns," naming LEO DE AITZEMA as their Resident in London, and special letters from Hamburg by itself were also read separately, recommending the same gentleman. When we remember the unsatisfactory behaviour of Hamburg in the infancy of the Republic, this is very symptomatic.[1]

---

[1] The particulars are gathered chiefly from the Commons Journals of dates given and others, and from various letters in Thurloe's Collection, Vol. I. 206—232.

[2] Commons Journals of dates, and Thurloe, I. 217.

COUNTY OF OLDENBURG:— In Christopher Arnold's letter of gossip from London of date August 7, 1651 (see ante p. 351) he speaks of being much with one HERMANN MYLIUS, recently come to London as "envoy from the illustrious Count of Oldenburg to the English Republic." That one German Prince should, at that comparatively early time, have commissioned an agent to the English Commonwealth, and that this prince should have been Frederick, Count of Oldenburg and Delmenhorst, representing one of the oldest reigning houses of Europe (from which are descended, genealogists tell us, the Emperors of Russia, the Kings of Denmark, and the late royal family of Sweden), are rather remarkable facts, to be accounted for perhaps by something peculiar in the character of the prince or in his circumstances at the time. Certain it is that HERMANN MYLIUS was in London on his behalf more than a month before the Battle of Worcester. Not till the 15th of October, 1651, however, were his letters of credence attended to by Parliament and his business referred to the Council of State. We shall hear of him and his business again.[2]

ITALIAN STATES:—Since the 15th of May, 1651, the recognised agent in London for the *Grand-Duke of Tuscany* had been AMERIGO SALVETTI, living in great St. Bartholomew's; and there was occasional business between him and the Council of State, with new letters from the Grand-Duke himself, through the rest of that year and the whole of 1652.—So with *Venice*, the reception of whose public minister dates from June 15, 1652; and so also with *Genoa*, whose agent, FRANCESCO BERNARDI, had been received as early as September 16, 1651.[3]

SPAIN:—Ever since the most Catholic power in Europe had found it expedient to come to a friendly understanding with the English Commonwealth, or to pretend such, the Spanish ambassador, DON ALONSO DE CARDENAS, had continued to reside in London as perhaps the first of the diplomatic grandees. Naturally there were from time to time questions of difficulty between the two strangely allied powers. The English Government had still to insist on more effective justice for the murder of Ascham than the Court of Madrid had seen fit to accord; and Philip IV. and his minister Don Luis de Haro, watching, from a Spanish point of view, the negotiations, and then the struggle, between England and the Dutch, found frequent occasion for letters and interferences.

---

[1] Commons Journals of date given and others.

[2] Commons Journals of date given (where Mylius's name is misprinted *Alylias*); and a Letter in Thurloe, I. 385—6 (wrongly placed, as we shall see).

[3] Commons Journals of dates.

Hence much business between Cardenas and the Council of State through our present period, with once (December 14, 1652) a great audience before Parliament itself, when he delivered a speech in Spanish and two bundles of papers. Cardenas had, in fact, proposed a definite and binding treaty, political and commercial, between England and Spain, and had submitted twenty-four draft articles for the same.[1]

PORTUGAL:—Rebuffed so decidedly in the former attempt at a Treaty with the English through the Portuguese envoy Guimaraes (ante p. 275), the Court of Lisbon decided at last to yield those points which Guimaraes had been instructed to refuse. Accordingly, on the 17th of August, 1652, there was announced in the House the arrival of an actual ambassador-extraordinary from John IV. in place of the former mere envoy. He had his grand audience of the House on the 30th of September; under which date the Journals record clumsily, "The Ambassador's name was *John Roderick* * * *." In fact he was a certain DON RODERIGO SA, great Chamberlain of the Portuguese King. He was referred, of course, to the Council of State; and the result of long negotiations between him and the Council, varied by another grand audience with the House (December 16), was that certain preliminaries of a Treaty with Portugal were already signed in January 1652–3. The "Portugal Ambassador" seems soon to have acquired the reputation in London of being a very silly man. Three things may be mentioned of him. He came more gorgeously dressed for his audiences with the House than any ambassador had done before; he distinguished himself by the excess of his demonstrativeness on all occasions against the Dutch, actually celebrating the English victories by fireworks before his door; and he had brought with him a brother, Don Pataleon Sa, who was more foolish than himself.[2]

FRANCE:—Since the formation of the English Republic there had been all but a sheer vacuum of diplomatic relations between it and France. Bellièvre, who had been French Ambassador in London at the time of the execution of Charles I., had been recalled shortly afterwards; no successor had been appointed; the widowed Henrietta-Maria had lived on at or near Paris, still a pensioner of the French crown, with liberty to receive visits from Charles II. and her other children; nay, since the escape of Charles II. to the continent after the battle of Worcester, he too had resided at or near Paris, with a separate allowance latterly of 6000 livres per month from the French excise. All this looked like proper resentment of the Regicide, proper anti-Republican feeling on the part of a Monarchy, and proper respect for the aunt and cousins of the

---

[1] Commons Journals of dates from Jan. 1, 1651—2 to April 13, 1653; entries in Council of State Order Books; Guizot, I. 269, and Appendix of Documents, No. XXI.

[2] Commons Journals of dates given and others; Order Books of Council of State; Godwin, IV. 52; Thurloe, I. 316—317.

French King in their misfortunes. But, on the other hand, there was no rupture with the English nation. M. de Croullé, who had been secretary to Bellièvre, had been directed to remain in London, partly as a kind of unaccredited *chargé d'affaires* for France, partly as a spy for Mazarin. He remained there, corresponding diligently with Mazarin, and known to Vane and other Londoners in a vague semi-official way as " Crowley, the French Secretary," till December 1650, when he was arrested for allowing Englishmen to attend mass in his house, brought before the Council of State, and ordered out of England. About the same time M. RENÉ AUGIER, who had been Resident Agent in Paris for the English Parliament, was recalled to London. Still there was no rupture; and an attempt was even made by Mazarin to replace Croullé by another agent, M. DE GENTILLOT, who might reside in London in the French interest without credentials. This the Council of State would not allow, and M. de Gentillot had to return. All this apparent indifference to relations with England on the part of France, however, only disguised a real anxiety. Since the Peace of Westphalia the long and wide strife on the Continent had narrowed itself into that single war between France and Spain of which the Spanish Netherlands were the chief theatre; and Mazarin, while carrying on this war, could not but have his eye on the possible consequences to France of the growing friendliness between Spain and England. Then, again, within France itself there was the Insurrection or Civil War of the Frondeurs, rendering his own position as the supreme minister in conjunction with the Queen Mother during the minority of Louis XIV. more and more precarious; and some of the leading Frondeurs had been opening negotiations with England on their own account. A certain M. DE BARRIERE had been received by the English Parliament on the 31st of March, 1652, with letters of credence from Louis de Bourbon, the great Prince of Condé; the City of Bordeaux, in alliance with Condé and the Fronde, had sent two special messengers of its own to London—M. DE BLANOT and M. DE TRANCOUS: what might not be the issue of the negotiations between these agents and the English Council of State? One issue was that the English Parliament resolved, August 24, 1652, on the recommendation of the Council of State, to suspend a previous act prohibiting the importation of French wines, wool, and silk, but only in favour of " such ports and places in France " as might be thought suitable. Was Mazarin to let France be thus split up, and his own authority set aside, by an arrangement between England and certain portions of the French King's subjects? Why should he not adopt the course to which the French merchants everywhere, and the strenuous recommendation of the economist Colbert, were urging him, and formally recognise the English Republic by despatching to it a fully accredited minister from Louis XIV.? The Queen-Regent still shrinking from that course, he did his best for a while by renewed attempts at secret or indirect negotiation through M. DE GENTILLOT and others; but at length he and the Queen Mother were compelled. Blake, while cruising in the Channel on the outlook for De Witt and De Ruyter, had not hesitated to capture a squadron of seven French ships which were carrying provisions to Dunkirk, then besieged by the Spaniards (September 5, 1652); and to the vehement remonstrances on this outrage by the Duke de Vendôme, Grand Admiral of France, the only reply of the English Council of State and Parliament was that Blake had done quite right, that the ships could not be released, and that, in the existing relations between France and England, the like might happen again. Mazarin then succumbed. He despatched M. DE BORDEAUX, Councillor of State and Intendant of Picardy, as an accredited minister to England. The arrival of this gentleman with his letters of credence from Louis XIV. was reported to the House by the Speaker on the 14th of December; but, as the letters were addressed only "*A nos très chers amis les Gens du Parlement de la République d'Angleterre*," they were at once returned to M. de Bordeaux, with the information that they could not be recognised. Three days afterwards they were presented again, with the address properly amended into "*Au Parlement de la République d'Angleterre*," and then the Council of State was instructed to treat with M. de Bordeaux, according to the diplomatic courtesies due to him as public minister only and not full ambassador. Mazarin, having reason to believe that a complete political alliance between France and England against Spain was out of the question in the mean time, had purposely sent M. de Bordeaux in the inferior capacity, with a view to a commercial treaty only. He probably soon regretted the caution. For Cardenas, the Spanish Ambassador, had been roused to fresh action by the arrival of the French Envoy, and his full ambassadorial rank gave him advantages. What *he* was aiming at now was a complete political alliance between England and Spain against France; and, if this project was to be disconcerted, Mazarin must bid higher. As it was, the mission of M. de Bordeaux to England struck dread in one quarter. "Since my great misfortune, I have never felt anything equal to this," wrote Henrietta Maria to her second son, the Duke of York, then meditating service in the French army; and she announced at the same time that his brother, Charles II., had resolved to leave France in disgust. The resolution was reconsidered. The six thousand livres a month detained him.[1]

MISCELLANEOUS:—In addition to all the foregoing mass of foreign business for the Council of State in the way of negotiation with regular Ambassadors and Envoys, there had, from the end of 1651 to the beginning of 1653, been many incidental items of foreign business. There had been letters from *Amsterdam and Rotterdam*, from the *States of West Holland and Friesland* on their own account, from the *Duke of Courland*, from the *Archduke Leopold*, from *Cologne*, from *Zurich*, from the *Swiss Cantons*, &c. &c. One of these communications, that from Switzerland, translated itself into a resident London Agency. The letters, bearing to be from the Landamann Scultete and the Senators of the Evangelical Cantons of Switzerland, had been brought by a messenger or commissioner of some distinction, called JOHANNES JACOBUS STOCKARTUS; and on the 15th of April, 1653, the Parliament authorized the Council of State to give this STOCKARTUS an honourable reception.[1]

---

[1] Guizot's *Cromwell and the English Commonwealth* (Eng. Ed. 1854), I. 198—273, with Appendices of documents; *Milton State Papers* (by Nickolls), pp. 41 and 43; Clarendon, pp. 777—778; Commons Journals of various dates given; and entries in Council Order Books.

Let us return to the internal affairs of England. Through all the multiplicity of business with Scotland, Ireland, and Foreign Powers, and through the strain of the naval war with the Dutch, there had been no neglect of these.

Since the Battle of Worcester there had been much discussion of five great subjects:—(1) *Retrenchment of the Public Expenses and Reduction of Taxation.* What was done under this head may be summed up by saying that the Army for England and Scotland, which at the time of the Battle of Worcester numbered at least 35,000 horse and foot, had been reduced by various votes at the close of 1651 to about 25,000, and that there had been a corresponding reduction of the garrisons, so that the total Army Estimates for England, Scotland, and Ireland, were fixed at £90,000 per month. In June 1652 there were proposals of farther military retrenchment, which were stopped by Cromwell's influence; and the war with the Dutch immediately afterwards entailed so much additional expense that it was resolved, Dec. 4, 1652, that the charge for the Army and Navy should be £120,000 per month, of which only £80,000 should go to the Army, while the Navy should have £40,000. To relieve the public of part of this charge, a Bill was passed, Dec. 31, for the sale of Windsor Castle and Park, Hampton Court, Hyde Park, Greenwich Park, and other Royal Palaces and Parks. A similar Bill was brought in for the sale of the Royal Forests, and certain Cathedrals were threatened. (2) *Oblivion*

---

[1] Scattered entries in the Commons Journals, with entry under the date given.

of past Political Differences. From the very beginning of the Commonwealth there had been an anxiety on the part of its chiefs, and especially on the part of Cromwell, that past political differences should be forgotten, and the old Royalists and Presbyterians included as far as possible in the same citizenship with the Independents and other Republicans. A Bill to this end had been introduced early in 1649, but had been frustrated by the new commotions for Charles II. during the war with the Scots. After Worcester, however, it was at once revived; and, after much debate, in the course of which Cromwell was even more conspicuous than Vane on the side of extreme indulgence and comprehension, it was passed, Feb. 25, 1651–2, under the title of "A Bill for General Pardon and Oblivion." With a very few specified exceptions, there was to be a pardon of all treasons and other political offences committed before Sept. 3, 1651, with a remission of all penalties, sequestrations, &c., so incurred, the benefit of the same to extend to all who would merely engage now to be faithful to the Commonwealth as established without King or House of Lords. There is evidence that the Bill did have a wide effect, morally as well as legally. There were still, of course, many passionate Royalists in England, cherishing the memory of the Royal Martyr and their allegiance to his son. Among others, however, the Royalist passion had become much more mild, or had begun to reason with itself. After all, had not the Stuart dynasty been but an importation from Scotland into England, a thing of but fifty-five recent, and those rather inglorious, years in English History? As there had been a great English History before the Stuarts came in, and such Englishmen as Raleigh had even dreamt of an English Republic as an experiment preferable to their admission, why hanker after them too fondly now? Were they essential to the England of the future? Probably nothing contributed more to this state of sentiment than the boldness of the Republican leaders in their dealings with foreign powers. The patriotism of Englishmen as such was stirred by the war with the Dutch. Blake's naval victories were national triumphs, of which all Englishmen could be proud.

The Republic had, at all events, ennobled England once more in the eyes of the rest of Europe. (3) *Law-Reform.* On the 26th of December, 1651, the Parliament returned to this subject, which had been in their view for some time, and it was resolved "That it be referred to persons out of the "House to take into consideration what inconveniences there "are in the Law, and how the mischiefs that grow from the "delays, the chargeableness, and the irregularities in the pro-"ceedings in the Law, may be prevented, and the speediest "way to reform the same, and to present their opinions to "such Committee as the Parliament shall appoint." A Committee of twenty-seven, with Cromwell at their head, and Whitlocke and other lawyers of the house included, was at the same time appointed to select the persons out of the House fit for so great a business. On the 14th and 17th of January, 1651–2, after report from this Committee, the House nominated one-and-twenty persons for the purpose. They were a miscellaneous body, including some eminent lawyers, such as Matthew Hale, who was named first, the Recorder of London, who was named second, but also merchants, soldiers, and others. Hugh Peters was one; John Rushworth was another; and a third was a certain Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, of whom the world was to hear a great deal more before he died. He was a Dorsetshire baronet of large estates, who had studied law at Lincoln's Inn after leaving Oxford, had been returned to the Short Parliament for the borough of Tewkesbury when he was but eighteen years of age, but had not sat in the Long Parliament. At the beginning of the Civil War he had taken the King's side; but he had afterwards gone over to the Parliamentarians, and served in their Army, tending from the Presbyterians to the Independents, and so at length to the Commonwealth. He was now thirty years of age, with an extraordinary reputation already for ability and subtlety. How he and Hugh Peters harmonized as colleagues in the Law Reform Commission can only be guessed; the probability is that Hale and the other lawyers ruled the proceedings. They must have been of an arduous kind. No conviction of the day was more general than that the English Law, in all its departments, was an Augean stable of abuses, the thorough cleansing of which might be a fit labour for Hercules. There were the wildest ideas on the subject, and pamphlets on it abounded. Not till after a year did the results of the labours of the Commission emerge, and then in the form of a "Book containing the whole system of the Law," which the House spent two whole days in reading (Jan. 20, 21, 1652–3), and of which 300 copies were ordered to be printed, for the use of "the members of the Parliament only." And so the matter rested, save that on the 8th of February a special Committee was appointed to consider "of the ancient penal laws," and "which of them are fit to be continued and which are fit to be taken away." (4) *Pauperism and Poor Laws.* On the 27th of April, 1652, it was resolved in Parliament "That it be referred to a Com-"mittee to consider how and by what means the Poor may "be set to work throughout the nation, and such Poor as are "not able to work may be relieved," and also "That it be "referred to the same Committee to revise all the laws "touching the relief of the Poor," and to receive and con-"sider such proposals as shall be tendered unto them by "any persons for the better effecting the premises." Cromwell was on this Committee, with nineteen others. On this vast subject also the wildest ideas were abroad, ranging from the crotchets of individual economists and engineers to speculations absolutely communistic. Steering through these, the Committee did frame a Bill of some comprehensive kind. It was read twice, and committed Oct. 12; it was again discussed in Feb. 1652–3; but there were difficulties, and it was postponed. (5) *Regulation of the Press.* Bradshaw's Press Act of Sept. 20, 1649 (ante pp. 116–118) had been for two years only, and had expired on the 29th of September, 1651. As the right of suppressing scandalous pamphlets, and of punishing their authors and printers, seemed no less vital than ever to the Government, it was deemed necessary to renew the Act. This was done Jan. 7, 1651–2, and both Parliament and the Council of State continued to seize books or pamphlets that were considered dangerous.[1]

A business contemporary with all the foregoing, but of more intense and complex interest than any of them, was that designated by the phrase THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL. The phrase by no means suggests now all that it then conveyed. One interprets it now as meaning merely missionary effort for the preaching of the Gospel in places where it has never been preached already, or preached but scantily. In various Acts passed by the Parliament in the first years of the Commonwealth this also had been mainly the meaning of the phrase. Thus, on the 27th of July, 1649, in consequence of the interest felt in Eliot's Apostleship among the American Indians, there had been an Act "for the Promoting and Propagating of the Gospel of Jesus Christ in New England," and for incorporating a society, known thenceforth as "The Society for the Propagation of the Gospel," the special object of which was the diffusion of Christianity and education among the Indian natives. So also in 1650 there had been various Acts for the Better Propagation of the Gospel in Wales, in Ireland, in the Four Northern Counties of England, and in other specified districts and towns. In these the intention clearly was the encouragement of what we should now call Home Missions. But on the 7th of June, 1650, there had been an order for the preparation of "A General Bill for the Advancement of the Gospel in all parts of this Commonwealth," and it is to this General Bill that we have now to attend. In a repetition, on the 13th of September, of the order for bringing it in, one finds it described as "A Bill for Propagating the Gospel through the whole nation and also for ejecting scandalous ministers"; and, when it was actually brought in and passed the first and second readings, it was entitled "An Act for the Better Propagation and Preaching of the Gospel, and maintenance of ministers, and other pious uses." This had been on the 23rd of May, 1651; and the Bill had since then lain in

---

[1] The Commons Journals are the chief authority for the facts in this paragraph, and the dates given will indicate the places there; but, under heads 1 and 2, I have derived information from Godwin, III. 401—404, and 407—413.

Committee. It emerged, however, in our present period, and then with such a vast extension of its purport that it exercised the House and the public mind more deeply and laboriously than anything else. The apparently simple phrase *The Propagation of the Gospel* had come in fact to mean *The Supply and Sustenance of a Preaching Ministry throughout the Commonwealth*, and had rolled into itself all the questions that could be stirred by the discussion of that subject in all its implications and connexions.[1]

Consider what these were. In the first place, there was the enormous preliminary question whether the Civil Magistrate had anything to do with the subject at all, whether the Propagation of the Gospel or the consideration of means thereto was within his business. In other words, there was the whole question over again between Church Establishments and the Principle of absolute Religious Voluntaryism. Was not Parliament, in its laudable anxiety for the propagation of the Gospel, stepping beyond its own bounds in proposing in any way whatever to be itself the agency for that purpose? Now that there was an opportunity, in the clear light of a Republic, of reconsidering the matter fundamentally, and of ridding England of a State-Church altogether, by sweeping away that incubus of a Presbyterian Establishment which had been voted a few years ago for the whole nation, but had fixed itself only in London and Lancashire, was the Parliament to be content with patching on additions to that State-Church, such as might annex to it the general body of the Independent ministry, thus only setting up in England a State-Church that might be called Presbyteriano-Independent? Roger Williams's Individualism or Ultra-Voluntaryism had by this time made such way in England that there were many to ask these questions. The Presbyterians, on the other hand, were naturally eager in defence of that theory of Church-Establishments to which they owed their present possession; many of the Independent clergy also disclaimed Voluntaryism, and argued in behalf of what they called "a settled ministry" in the nation; and, though there were vulgar retorts that the former only clung to their "loaves and fishes," and that the latter only wanted to share the same, the cause of "a Settled Ministry" was so well supported, and by so many able and good men, that it was undoubtedly in favour with Parliament. But then, suppose that preliminary question settled by a decisive vote that the Civil Magistrate *had* a right to undertake the Propagation of the Gospel, what other questions followed! What was the Civil Magistrate to treat as the Gospel; or, in other words, what was to be the standard of doctrine for the Established Church, or what latitude of doctrine was to be allowed among the Preaching Ministry appointed by the State? Was the Theology to be exclusively that of the Westminster Assembly; or was the Commonwealth to relax that Theology more or less, and authorize a wider liberty of doctrine among the State-clergy? Then what of the preaching, apart from the State-Church, of what the State itself could not recognise as being strictly, or in any way, the Gospel, but might even regard as the contrary? Had the State the right not only of propagating what it thought the Gospel, but also of stopping the propagation of what it thought to be against the Gospel? Here was the question of Toleration over again, in the form of the relations in which the State-Church was to stand to the universal community, and of the amount of liberty to be granted to Dissent and Heresy beyond the pale of the State-Church. Nor was this all. The theological standards of the State-Church once conclusively determined, and also the amount of Toleration to be accorded to Dissent from it and to preaching beyond its pale, how were the ministers of the State-Church to be selected? Were they to be taken from the Universities only, or from the Universities and other recognised places of learning together, or were all persons and sundry who imagined that they had the necessary graces and gifts to be allowed to offer themselves for trial? Who were to be the examiners of candidates for the State-ministry, and what were to be the forms of their ordination or admission? When parishes fell vacant, who were to exercise the patronage—the congregations, or the old lay patrons, or the State itself acting by Commission? All these difficulties cleared, there was still the final question how the State-clergy were to be paid. Was the old Tithe-system to be preserved; or were the Tithes of the whole nation to be consolidated into a central Fund, whence allowances should be portioned out among the clergy according to the importance of their charges; or was a Sustentation Fund to be provided in some other way by public taxation; or was the State only to supply a minimum salary for each minister, leaving each congregation to add what it chose?

---

[1] Commons Journals of days named.

There has been no exaggeration here of the complexity and variety of the problems that were discussed in England from the end of the year 1651 to the beginning of the year 1653 under the name of *The Propagation of the Gospel.* The full agitation of the business dates from Feb. 10, 1651–2. On that day, doubtless not without prior arrangement with some of the chiefs of the Commonwealth, Mr. John Owen and divers other well-known ministers of the Independent persuasion presented themselves at the bar of Parliament, and, after a verbal statement, left a Petition and certain documents, "with a Printed Book," for the consideration of the House. Their Petition, we shall find afterwards, referred to "the Printed Book," a very heretical one; but that does not concern us now. Immediately the House appointed a large Committee of forty, with Cromwell among them, and Mr. Rous, Sir James Harrington, and Mr. Millington in chief charge, to consider the petition and documents and report. But they also took the opportunity to appoint a smaller Committee of fourteen, Cromwell again included, "to confer "with those ministers whose names are subscribed to the "former petition, or any other persons, and to consider with "them upon such proposals as shall be offered for the Better "Progagation of the Gospel, and to report the same, with "their opinion thereon, to the House." It is to the proceedings of this smaller committee of fourteen, of whom five were to be quorum, that we have meanwhile to attend. For months and months everybody heard of this *Committee for the Propagation of the Gospel*, of its conferences with the Petitioning ministers, and of the shoals of suggestions that were poured in upon it from other quarters. Especially there was an eager curiosity about certain "Proposals" made to it by the Petitioning ministers, which "Proposals" were forming, it was known, the very backbone of the deliberations. By the end of March these were accessible to the public in print. They were *fifteen* in number, and substantially as follows:—

1. Persons of godliness and gifts, though not ordained, to be allowed to preach, and to "receive the public maintenance," when approved and called.

2. None to be admitted to trial but those who bring a testimonial from six godly persons, met for the purpose, of whom two at least to be ministers.

3. A committee of ministers and others in every County for examining and approving candidates.

4. Residue of scandalous ministers and schoolmasters throughout England to be removed.

5. A roving Commission to be appointed by Parliament for this purpose.

6. Said Commission to split itself, the parts going in six circuits.

7 & 8. Other powers to said Commissioners, including that of dividing and uniting parishes.

9. All ministers "so sent forth and established" to be enjoined to pray, read, preach, visit the sick, instruct from house to house, &c.

10. No person to be required to take the Sacraments, nor any minister to administer them where he does not see fit.

11. A law to be passed requiring all persons whatsoever within the nation "to attend to the public preaching of the Gospel every Lord's Day in places commonly allowed and usually called churches, except such persons as through scruple of conscience do abstain from these assemblies."

12. Explanation to be made to those who scruple to attend *consecrated* places of worship that such places are used merely for conveniency.

13. "That all persons dissenting from the doctrine and way of worship owned by the State, or consenting thereunto and yet not having advantage or opportunity of some of the public meeting-places commonly called churches, be required to meet (if they have any constant meetings) in places publicly known, and to give notice to some magistrate of such their place of ordinary meetings."

14. "That such as do not receive, but oppose, those principles of the Christian Religion without acknowledgment of which the

Scriptures do clearly and plainly affirm that Salvation is not to be obtained . . . may not be suffered to preach or promulgate anything in opposition unto such principles"—Having been required by the Committee to be more precise under this head, the Ministers had given in a list of Fifteen Christian Fundamentals, the public preaching against which was to be illegal.

15. "Parliament to take some speedy course for the utter suppressing of that abominable cheat of Judicial Astrology."[1]

These Proposals purported to represent the views of about twenty leading Divines, now reckoned as Independents. Among them, besides Owen, were Thomas Goodwin, Nye, Simpson, and Bridge (four of the original five Independents of the Westminster Assembly), Greenhill and Carter (who had tended to Independency in the Assembly from the first), Adoniram Byfield (one of the clerks of the Assembly, and not then suspected of Independency), John Durie (who had gone more and more into Independency in the Assembly and afterwards), and, *mirabile dictu!* John Goodwin of Coleman Street, the Libertarian and Tolerationist. One finds also that Whalley, Okey, and other distinguished Army men, concurred. Altogether, the Proposals were thought to be a considerable stretch of liberality; and indeed the proposers professed to have framed them with "equal respects to all persons fearing God, though of differing judgments." Evidently, however, they were but a kind of scheme half-way—a scheme of a State-Church much less formal than that of the Presbyterians, and with a Toleration round about it, but still a scheme of a distinct State-Church and of a Toleration within fixed limits. If, on the one hand, therefore, the Presbyterians and other strait religionists regarded the Proposals with alarm as far too lax, the Voluntaries and extreme Tolerationists, on the other hand, condemned them as Machiavellian and unspiritual. Nor, though John Goodwin, in some whim or for some purpose, had attached himself for the time to Messrs. Owen and the rest, were there wanting remonstrants in his room. The *Committee for the Propagation of the Gospel*, it seems, had

---

[1] "The Humble Proposals of Mr. Owen and other ministers who presented the Petition to Parliament, &c. Printed at London for Robert Ibbetson, 1652." The date "March 31" is given in the Thomason copy.

"freely, and with abundance of Christian civility and gentleness, received many and several papers from many and several sorts of men and consciences"; and among these had been papers presented by a Major Butler, for himself, and for Mr. Charles Vane, Colonel Danvers, and others, criticising the Fifteen Proposals of Mr. Owen and his fellow-petitioners, hoping that God would yet "stir up the hearts of these worthy men to put in some Christian retractation," and earnestly offering to the Committee these four cardinal considerations in the meantime :—

1. "Whether Christ Jesus, the Lord of the harvest, doth not send forth labourers into his vineyard, furnishing them by his Spirit, and bearing witness to their labours, without the testimony and reward of men?"

2. "Whether it be not the will or counsel of God that there must be heresies, yea damnable heresies, that such who are approved may be made perfect, and whether it be not the pleasure of God that the judgment and condemnation of such false teachers and heretics be left to Himself?"

3. "Whether for the Civil Powers to assume a judgment in spirituals be not against the liberties given by Christ Jesus to his people?"

4. "Whether it be not the duty of the Magistrate to permit the Jews, whose conversion we look for, to live freely and peaceably amongst us?"[1]

Evidently here was a protest in favour of Absolute Voluntaryism and complete Toleration. We have it on the authority of the persons who tendered the protest to the Committee that they regarded Cromwell as essentially with them in the Toleration part of it, and as the man in the Committee likeliest to give their Propositions due weight. "His Excellency the Lord General," it appears, had twice, in full Committee and "in a confluence of many auditors," honoured Major Butler's papers with his approval in one point at least. "I shall need no Revelation," he had said on the first occasion,

---

[1] "The Fourth Paper presented by Major Butler to the Hon. Committee of Parliament for the Propagating of the Gospel . . . Together with a Testimony to the said Fourth Paper, by way of explanation upon the four Proposals of it, by R. W., &c. Printed for Giles Calvert, at the Black Spread Eagle at the West End of Paul's: 1652." In this tract, published "May 30," the day before the authorized edition of Owen's Proposals, these Proposals are given, with comments.

"to discover to me the man that endeavours to impose upon his brethren." But his second saying was still more remarkable. "When it pleased an honourable gentleman of the Committee zealously to argue against a Laodicean or lukewarm indifferency to Religion, professing for his part that he would rather be a Saul than a Gallio, his Excellency, with much Christian zeal and affection for his own conscience, professed also that he had rather that Mahometanism were permitted amongst us than that one of God's children should be persecuted."[1] With Cromwell in the Committee, thus still, as he had always been, the impassioned champion of Liberty of Conscience, there was every confidence that, whatever tendency there might be in the main to the Fifteen Proposals of Mr. Owen and the other Independents, the Committee would not lapse in what was all-essential.

While the Committee were deliberating the Authoritative Proposals and all sorts of Proposals besides, there was a rather significant indication in the House itself how matters would ultimately go. On the 29th of April, 1652, the subject of Tithes came up somehow, and it was resolved "That it be referred to the Committee appointed to receive Proposals for the better Propagation of the Gospel to take into speedy consideration how a competent and convenient maintenance for a godly and able ministry may be settled, in lieu of Tithes, and present their opinion thereon to the House; And that Tithes shall be paid as formerly until such maintenance be settled." This last clause had not been carried without a division. Sir Gilbert Pickering and Henry Marten had led seventeen members into the lobby against it, while the votes in favour of it, told by Mr. Bond and Mr. Say, were only twenty-seven. Although the Committee were expected to be ready soon with their opinion on the special subject of a substitute for Tithes, they do not seem to have been in a hurry. Probably they found it too difficult, and reserved it for a later stage of their proceedings. Indeed, after the first few months of 1652, the Committee flagged, so that on the 8th of October it had to be revived by a vote of the House, with orders that it should sit again *de die in diem.* Meanwhile the public outside had taken up the question of the Continuance or Abolition of Tithes for themselves, and were debating it with extraordinary zest. Defenders of Tithes, and especially Clerical Defenders of them, became more and more unpopular, and were attacked in pamphlets.[1]

---

[1] Preface by R. W. to the tract mentioned in last note.

Once more in England while all this controversy was going on, and of course at the very heart of it on the side of Absolute Voluntaryism and Toleration, was the American Roger Williams. After seven years of varied labour in those "Narragansett Bay Settlements" the incorporation of which into an independent colony he had secured in his last visit (Vol. III. p. 119), new schisms and difficulties there had brought this extraordinary man back in the character of an Envoy or Commissioner from his fellow-colonists to the authorities at home. The object was to put an end to divisions within the colony itself, secure it against interference from the Four Confederate Colonies, and obtain fresh powers. In company with another envoy, named Clarke, Williams had arrived in London on this errand early in 1652; and, while his special business with the Council of State was pending, he was at leisure to go about among his old acquaintances and to interest himself in English affairs. His lodging was "in St. Martin's, near the Shambles, at Mr. Davis, his house, a shoemaker, at the sign of the Swan"; but letters might be addressed to him also, he told his correspondents, "at Sir Henry Vane's at Whitehall." In fact he was now again, as in his former visit, much with Vane, with free use of Vane's house in town; and, while it was to Vane's influence that he chiefly trusted for success in his mission, it was from Vane also that he heard most intimately of English political matters, and through Vane's medium that he judged them. That Williams could not be silent or idle in the midst of that contest between Voluntaryism and the State-Church principle which he found agitating London on his arrival, in the guise of opposed sets of Proposals for the Propagation of the Gospel, might have been guessed without proof. Was he not the man in the whole world who had done most to propagate the theory of Absolute Voluntaryism in Religion or No State-Church of any kind; and might it not be said that the controversy he now found going on was the result in great part of the ideas he had himself sown in the English mind in his former visit, more especially in his famous book of 1644 called *The Bloody Tenent of Persecution*, and that the Voluntaries he now found so numerous in England were his own pupils? But the matter is not left to mere guess. *The Bloody Tenent yet more Bloody by Mr. Cotton's Endeavour to 'wash it white in the Blood of the Lamb'* was a publication of Williams in London in April, 1652, reasserting his principles with all his old fervour, when he had not been many weeks in England, in the form of a reply to an answer to his former book by Mr. Cotton of Boston; *The Hireling Ministry none of Jesus Christ's, or a Discourse on the Propagation of the Gospel*, was another publication of his in the same year; and in a third publication, also of that year, called *Ill news from New England, or a Narrative of New England's Persecutions*, his contribution to the controversy took the shape of information to the English respecting recent disgraceful persecutions of the Baptists and other Sectaries in the Confederated American Colonies, and of congratulation accordingly to the Mother Country on her superior temper. "While Old England is becoming new," he said, "New England is becoming old." In his letters also to correspondents we see the same highly excited interest in English affairs, with his hopes that, after all, in spite of remaining opposition, absolute Liberty of Conscience would prevail in England, and Tithes and the State-Church would disappear. He was to remain in England till the spring of 1654; and the fact that he was here again for two whole years at this critical time in English History, and in confidential communication with many persons of note, including not only Vane, but also Milton, Hugh Peters, Harrison, Lawrence, and even Cromwell himself, is far from unimportant. We shall have occasion to revert to it.[1]

---

[1] Commons Journals of dates given.

---

[1] Knowles's *Memoirs of Roger Williams, the Founder of the State of Rhode-Island* (Boston, 1834); Palfrey's *History of New England*, II. 356 et seq.; Cata-

It was a whole year after the original appointment of the *Committee for the Propagation of the Gospel* before they made even their first general report to Parliament. This was done by Mr. Scott on the 11th of February, 1652–3. It then appeared that the Committee had adopted, with some slight modifications, the first Twelve Proposals of Mr. Owen and the rest, abridging them into Eleven, but had agreed not to report to the House the three remaining Proposals. In other words, the Committee had thought it best that the question of a State-Church and its Constitution should be taken by itself, leaving the question of the Toleration of Dissent from the State Church, and of the limits of such Toleration, to come independently. The House, however, insisted that all the Proposals should be reported; and, accordingly, the Fifteen Proposals, reduced to Fourteen, were formally before the House that day, with the names of the ministers and others from whom they had originally emanated.[1] All then being ripe, the debate began on the 25th of February, with this first and most remarkable result: "The Question being "propounded, *That the Magistrate hath power, in matters of* "*Religion, for the Propagation of the Gospel*, and the question "being put, That this question be now put, It passed with "the affirmative; And, the main question being put, It was "Resolved by the Parliament *That the Magistrate hath power,* "*in matters of Religion, for the Propagation of the Gospel.*" Thus the momentous preliminary question was put out of

---

logue of Thomason Pamphlets for 1652; Gammell's *Life of Roger Williams* (Boston, 1845).—I am inclined to believe that the "R. W." who edited the "Four Proposals" of Major Butler and his friends, suggesting unlimited toleration and the entire abolition of a State Church as the proper issue of the deliberations of the *Committee for the Propagation of the Gospel* (see preceding notes, pp. 393—394), was no other than Roger Williams. If so, we have him at the very centre of that remarkable transaction, and the interesting anecdotes about Cromwell in connexion with it are from his pen.—The pamphlet called *Ill News from New England* is ascribed to Roger Williams by his biographers on what I suppose to be good authority; but the original publication (May 13, 1652, as marked by Thomason) bears on the title-page to have been "by John Clark, Physician of Rode Island in America," i. e. by Williams's colleague in his mission. Besides the main title, it has this sub-title: "*Also Four Proposals to the Honoured Parliament and Council of State, touching the way to Propagate the Gospel of Christ (with small charge and great safety) both in Old England and New.*"

[1] See the very interesting entry in the Commons under the date given. I have derived some of the names of Mr. Owen's original associates in the Proposals from the list there given, which bears the date Feb. 18, 1651—2.

the way, and it was decided, doubtless to the chagrin of thousands, that the English Republic could not adopt the Voluntary principle, but must have a State Church like its neighbours. Nothing remained then but to discuss the Proposals one by one, so as to settle the constitution of such a Church. The amount of progress made, with the amendments on the first three Proposals as they passed the House, is thus exhibited in the Commons Journals:—

March 4, 1652–3:—"Resolved by the Parliament, That persons of godliness and gifts, of the Universities, and others, though not ordained, that shall be approved, shall receive the public maintenance for preaching the Gospel."

March 18, 1652–3:—"Resolved by the Parliament, That no person shall be admitted to trial and approbation unless he bring a Testimonial of his piety and soundness in the faith under the hands of six godly Ministers and Christians, gathered together for that end and purpose, unto whom he is personally known; of which number two at the least to be ministers."

April 1, 1653:—"Resolved, That a certain number of persons, ministers and others, of known ability and godliness, be appointed to sit in every County, to examine, judge, and approve all such persons as, being called to preach the Gospel, have received testimonials as above; and, in case there shall not be found a competent number of such persons in the same County, that others of one or more neighbour Counties be joined to them."

Law-Reform, Pauperism and the Poor Laws, the Constitution of a new State-Church that should be less formal than the Presbyterian, more Erastian in principle, and yet more popular: on these three great subjects, it will be seen, the Rump Government, with all its industry, had made but little way. Was it not grappling with an amount of work beyond its strength? True, the House could reckon itself as consisting of 120 members, for that number had been present at the election of the new Council of State in November 1652; and true that on two or three occasions in that same year more than eighty members had been present at more ordinary votes. On the whole perhaps there had been larger Houses in the Fourth and Fifth years of the Republic than before, success having had that effect among others. Still a House of over seventy had been a rarity; and since the Fifth year of the Republic began (December 1, 1652) the largest recorded attendance had been sixty-one. Often fewer than forty were present, and a House of over fifty was a good one. With such Houses could such great measures be matured and pushed through in a way that could be permanent and satisfactory to the nation? Or, if the numerical strength was sufficient, was there not the consideration of time? Could the Rump expect to finish all it had begun? For, as may be remembered, a period had been fixed for the termination of the Rump Government by its own Act. The Rump Parliament was to cease, and another Parliament to come into being, on the 3rd of November, 1654, at the very latest. True, they were yet only in April 1653, and had eighteen months before them, if they chose to spin out their existence to the utmost. But would it be proper for them to do so? Would they even dare to do so? These were now the questions.

The Rump Parliament and the Council of State were the nominal Authority in the Commonwealth; but since Worcester there had been a distinctly rival Authority, represented by Lord General Cromwell.

Great as was Cromwell's influence in the Parliament and in the Council of State, that influence was by no means the measure of his power. He was the central figure of the whole Commonwealth, often addressed in his individual capacity by Foreign Powers and Princes, and petitioned or written to on all sorts of subjects by those at home who had grievances to complain of or projects to propound. "Great things God has done by you in war, and good things men expect from you in peace," is a phrase in one such letter. And in Cromwell himself there was a consciousness to correspond. How could it be otherwise? Modest as he was in his habitual demeanour, scrupulous to delicacy in all his references to himself or expressions about himself, he did yet carry in his inmost heart the belief that he had been God's chosen instrument for the greatest work of revolution ever accomplished in the British Islands. No Joshua of the Hebrews three thousand years ago can have had a more real belief of this kind about himself, as he reposed for a time in the inheritance voted him on Mount Ephraim, than that which possessed the soul of the Englishman Cromwell as he walked about Whitehall or about Hampton Court Palace in the year 1652. And, at the age of fifty-three, with all his faculties still at their best, could he consider his work over? On whom, if not on him, had God imposed the duty of farther leadership in England? Especially in the crisis which had now come, when the surviving residue of the Long Parliament were at last to resign the rule, and were to be succeeded by a new apparatus of government, previously devised and called into being by themselves, had not he, the creator of the Commonwealth, and more than twice its saviour, some right of supreme superintendence? Who was so well entitled to see that the new apparatus for its government accorded with his own ideal? Might it not even be a fair consideration, more important for England than for himself, what place *he* should occupy, or should find possible, in the new system of things? That such thoughts did roll in the mind of Cromwell daily in various forms is positively certain. One of Whitlocke's famous stories is to the effect that, as early as December 1651, or three months after the Battle of Worcester, Cromwell had called a select meeting of Parliament-men and Army-officers, Whitlocke himself included, at the House of Speaker Lenthall, and had openly sounded them on the question whether persistence in an Absolute Republic or "some mixture of Monarchy" would now be the proper policy. As the few who were in favour of "some mixture of Monarchy," Whitlocke himself one of them, could then conceive or propound no device for such a mixture but a treaty with one of the sons of the late King, the subject, adds Whitlocke, had been allowed by Cromwell to drop. The story, in its substance, though not in all Whitlocke's details, must be taken as authentic. The notion of some function by "a Single Person" in addition to a Parliament in the Government of the Commonwealth had doubtless occurred to Cromwell even thus early, and naturally with a clear conclusion, were the Single Person ever called for, who he should be. But indeed who can tell what variety of meditations, with what Biblical fervours and depths in each, passed in such a mind? Always, in trying to imagine them, we must remember Cromwell's own maxim, which he had made a rule for his conduct: "Not the encountering of "difficulties makes us to tempt God, but the acting before "and without faith." Cromwell, we may therefore say, was waiting for farther light.[1]

Cromwell's actual power consisted, of course, in his being the head of the Army. The Rump Parliament and the Council of State were the masters of the Commonwealth only because the Army had seen fit to put them there and keep them there; and naturally the Army, though dispersed through England, Ireland, and Scotland, had not lost the sense of its very peculiar relations to the men at the centre. Nor were there now divisions in the Army, or differences between the chiefs and the men, as in the old days of the Agitatorships. The Army, in political respects, was represented perfectly in its officers. Who were the chief of these under Cromwell? Take first Ireland, the Army of which was treated as a separate Establishment. Lieutenant-General Fleetwood, Cromwell's son-in-law, was Commander-in-chief in Ireland by Cromwell's appointment (since July 1652), with Lieutenant-General Ludlow next to him, and then Major-General Sir Hardress Waller, Colonels Hewson, Jones, Axtell, Barrowe, Phayre, Faulke, Sadler, Laurence, Zanchy, and others, among whom Cromwell's son, Colonel Henry Cromwell, must not be forgotten.[2] For England and Scotland the Army Establishment was regarded as one, and consisted, since its reduction after Worcester, of twenty-five regiments of foot, sixteen of horse, and one of dragoons. Of the portion of these forces in service in Scotland Lieutenant-General Monk was Commander-in-chief, with Major-General Dean next to him (until both were brought into England, late in 1652, to be turned into Sea-Generals), and then Colonel Robert Lilburne (who came after Monk and Dean in the chief command), with Colonels Overton, Fenwicke, Cobbet, Cooper, and Read. Of the forces quartered in England the most conspicuous officers under the Lord General were Major-General Lambert, Major-General Harrison, Major-General Desborough, Commissary-General Whalley, Colonels Rich, Tomlinson, Twistleton, Okey, Hacker, Saunders, Berry, Grosvenor, and Blundell, as Horse-Colonels, and Ingoldsby, Pride, Barkstead, Fairfax, Goffe, Sir Arthur Hasilrig, Haynes, Daniell, Ashfield, Fitch, Alured, Walton, and others, as Colonels of Foot.[1] Take all the above-mentioned officers in England, Scotland, and Ireland together, and they were equal in number to an average meeting of the Rump; suppose the Lieutenant-Colonels and Majors added, and the House in its fullest possible muster would have been considerably outnumbered. Seven of the officers named, as I count, were members of the Rump: viz. Fleetwood, Ludlow, Harrison, Rich, Ingoldsby, Hasilrig, and Walton; and all these, except Rich and Ingoldsby, had been at least twice in the Council of State—Hasilrig and Walton, indeed, in every one of the Councils. Even among these military members of the Rump and the Council of State (in both which bodies, it is to be remembered, there were other members still designated *Colonels* or the like, in recollection of their prior services) it might be a question, in a case of difference between the Government and the Army, whether the Government or the Army should have their allegiance. From among these, and from among their fellow-officers, in or about London, who were Army-officers only, and not burdened with any such sense of divided allegiance, there could always be a Council of officers round Lord General Cromwell, as numerous as an ordinary meeting of the Council of State, to discuss public affairs independently.

---

[1] Letters to Cromwell after Worcester in Milton State Papers by Nickolls, pp. 80 et seq.; Whitlocke, Dec. 10, 1651; Cromwell's Letter to Hammond in Nov. 1648 (Carlyle's *Letters and Speeches*, I. 344).

[2] I take this list chiefly from a document from Dublin, of date June, 1653, printed in *Merc. Pol.*, No. 160, but have obtained some of the names elsewhere.

Till August 1652 there had been no open signs of dissatisfaction in the Army with the proceedings of the Government-ment. Till then Cromwell and his officers had been in hopes that the mere exertion of their influence in or upon the House in ordinary ways would be sufficient, or even that the stimulus communicated to the House itself by the sense that 25,000 armed men were now at leisure over the land, with their eyes fixed on Westminster, would ensure spontaneous progress in those directions of reform on which the Army had set its heart. To such indirect Army-influence it had, in fact, been owing that the Rump had begun to busy itself with the questions of Law-Reform, Pauperism, and the Propagation of the Gospel. But the laziness on these questions, the "red-tapeism" as it would now be called, had at length made the Army impatient. More direct interference then seemed necessary. Accordingly, on the 13th of August, Commissary-General Whalley, and Colonels Okey, Goffe, Hacker, and Barksted, appeared at the bar of the House, and presented a petition drawn up at a Council of Officers at Whitehall on the preceding day, expressing the results of divers previous meetings in which the petitioners had "sought the Lord" and talked among themselves on the state of the Commonwealth. The Petition consisted of twelve articles urging on the Parliament greater alacrity in a host of subjects—the Propagation of the Gospel, the Abolition of Tithes, the Ejection of Profane and Scandalous Ministers, Law-Reform, Excise abuses, Army arrears, Employment of the Poor, Reduction of Official Salaries, the Mode of Keeping the Public Accounts, &c. Though the House did not like this ominous reappearance of the old habit of Army-dictation in the form of petitions, the officers were ceremoniously thanked, and a large Committee was appointed to report which particulars of the Petition were already "under consideration" in the House, and what progress had been made in them. Cromwell was on this Committee, with Harrison, Ingoldsby, Rich, Whitlocke, Marten, and twenty-eight others. Whitlocke had privately remarked to Cromwell on the arrogance of the Petition, and had advised him to stop such political meetings among his officers, as likely to "come too home to himself" some time; but he seemed to treat the matter lightly, "or rather to have some design in it."[1]

---

[1] I have derived the names from a State of the Reduced Forces for England and Scotland given in the Commons Journals under date October 2, 1651. The distribution between England and Scotland I have had to ascertain as well as I could by other means; and it may not be perfectly exact.

What effect the Petition may have had in quickening the pace of Parliament on the subjects of Law-Reform, Pauperism, and the Propagation of the Gospel, may be inferred, if dates are studied, from the account already given of the actual course of the proceedings on these subjects. On one paramount subject the Petition did certainly quicken the pace. The twelfth Article of the Petition, doubtless put last as the most important of all, reminded the Parliament of the approaching termination of its own existence, and of the necessity of a Bill that should settle definitely the constitution of future Parliaments. To this subject also, it is true, the Parliament had been adverting a little of its own accord. On the 7th of May, 1652, it had been resolved "That the Grand Committee upon the Act for setting a certain time for the Sitting of this Parliament and providing for successive Parliaments be revived"; and the Grand Committee so revived had met three times, viz. on May 12, 19, 26. Arrangements for one's own death, however, are not an agreeable occupation for public bodies any more than for individuals; and, as the death was not to be necessarily sooner than Nov. 3, 1654, neither the Rump nor its Grand Committee had found heart to go on with the business. The Petition of the officers reawakened them. On the 14th of September, just a month after the Petition had been received, it was resolved "That the Grand Committee for the Bill for "setting a certain time for the sitting of this present Parlia- "ment, and providing for successive Parliaments as to that "Bill, be dissolved, and the said Bill committed to a Committee "now to be chosen, to perfect the Bill, leaving a blank for "the time for dissolving this Parliament." The Committee actually chosen the same day was the very Committee that had been appointed to report on the Petition of the Officers; but all members of the House that chose to attend were to have voices, and the Committee might advise with any other persons whatsoever.[1]

---

[1] Commons Journals, Aug. 13, 1652; Whitlocke, of same date; Cromwell's "First Speech" (*Carlyle's Cromwell*, II. 339—344).

All seemed now in a fair way. The tradition in the House as to the proper constitution of a "New Representative" had hardly varied, so far as England herself was concerned, since Ireton's famous Reform Bill, or Draft *Agreement of the People*, in January 1648–9. The ideal in the main still was that there should be about 400 members of Parliament from all England and Wales, to be returned in certain proportions by the various counties, cities, and boroughs; nay, the proportions of members allotted in Ireton's scheme to the various counties, cities, and boroughs, still seemed in the main suitable. What more was needed than to settle also the numbers of members that should be returned by Ireland and Scotland, as now constitutent parts of the united Commonwealth, defining the districts in each country that should return the same? Unfortunately, much more was needed. Merely to issue writs for the assembling of a "New Representative" that was to consist of 400 members from England and Wales, and additions from Scotland and Ireland, without the most careful definition beforehand of the qualifications both of those that were to elect and of those that were to be eligible, would have been to rush on ruin. Were things left to mere chance, or even to such conditions of suffrage and eligibility as Ireton had marked out, or as had since roughly suggested themselves, what a Parliament might not one see! Might there not be Presbyterians in it and Malignants in it, in such numbers as to swamp the "Honest Party," reverse the whole policy of the nation for the last few years, undo the Commonwealth, and bring back the Stuarts? To this question, therefore, of the means for a due preservation of continuity between the small Parliament in possession and the large Parliament to come, the Committee had, most seriously of all, to address themselves. What definite proposals for the purpose arose among them one hardly knows; but it is certain that the difficulties were great, and that Cromwell and the Army-officers grew more and more anxious. From October 1652 onwards, they had meetings again and again with Vane, Hasilrig, and other leading members of the House, to the number of twenty or thirty at a time, to try to come to an understanding. And so, through the last months of 1652, when the war with the Dutch was going on, and the Commonwealth was passing out of the fourth year of its existence into the fifth, the chiefs of the Commonwealth were more divided among themselves than they had ever been before, and all was uneasiness and confusion. It was at this time, if Whitlocke's recollection is correct, that he had that long conversation with Cromwell in St. James's Park, in which Cromwell, taking him affectionately into confidence, first discoursed at large on the distracted state of public affairs, and then burst forth "What if a man should take upon him to be King?" Not many days after the reputed date of that conversation, the Parliament, on the recommendation of the Council of State, resolved that "Mr. Henry Stuart," the young boy known as the Duke of Gloucester, should be removed from the Isle of Wight, and sent abroad, with an allowance settled on him, to live with his relatives. He did go abroad, Jan. 1652–3; and, as *he*, rather than Charles or the Duke of York, was the favourite with those of the Commonwealth's-men who speculated on a new trial of Stuart kingship, people see Cromwell's hand in the coincidence.[1]

---

[1] Commons Journals of dates.

At last, on the 23rd of February, 1652–3, the Amended Bill for a New Representative was reported from the Committee to the House by Sir Arthur Hasilrig, and the debate was adjourned to the 2nd of March. On that day the proportions of members to be assigned to Scotland and Ireland were determined. The Committee had proposed thirty-three members from Scotland and thirty-seven from Ireland; but the House, after a close division relating to the proportion for Scotland, fixed the number for each country at thirty. There were but fifty-four members present in the House on this occasion; and the attendances were much smaller on the 9th, 16th, and 23rd of March, when the House proceeded to the English part of the Bill. On those three days they settled first that the town of Bedford should have *one* member and the county *five*, then that the town of Buckingham should have *one* and the county *five*, then that the city of Chester should have *one* and the county *four*, and so on through a straggling list of other cities, boroughs, and counties. In short, they seem to have determined in those three days the distribution of the 400 seats proposed for England. Then, on Wednesday the 30th of March, in a House of fewer than forty members, there was a discussion of the *property* qualifications of Electors, with two divisions; and on Wednesday the 13th of April the necessary *moral* qualifications of Electors were considered, the House agreeing to a clause requiring that all Electors should be persons of known integrity, fearing God, and not scandalous in their conversation. And this is the last that we hear of the Bill in the Journals.[1]

---

[1] Cromwell's "First Speech" (Carlyle, II. 341—342); Whitlocke, Nov. 1652; Commons Journals, Dec. 7, 1652; and Council Order Books, Dec. 4, 1652 and Jan. 14, 1652—3.

From nothing that appears in the Journals should we gather in the least these two all-important facts about the Bill, alleged on other authority,—(1) That it expressly provided that all the members of the Rump should continue in their places without re-election, and (2) That it reserved for a Committee of the Rump itself the right of superintending the elections of the rest and judging of their validity or fitness. Indeed, as no copy of the Bill has survived, nor any formal abstract of its contents, doubts have been thrown on these statements. Certain it is that Cromwell and his friends regarded the Bill as essentially one for the perpetuation and recruitment of the Rump, and acted accordingly. The antagonism between the two parties, in fact, was now both vehement and definite. There was the majority of the House, led by Vane, Marten, Hasilrig, Scott, Sir Peter Wentworth, and others, mostly civilians, all now as eager to pass a Dissolution Bill as for the last four years they had been reluctant, and indeed proposing to hasten the date of the Dissolution by making it the 3rd of November in the current year instead of the 3rd of November 1654, but resolved that the instrument of the Dissolution should be the actual Bill before the House arranging for the New Representative. On the other hand, there was Cromwell, with Lambert and Harrison, other Army-officers, and a small minority of the Parliament-men, equally resolute for a Dissolution, and indeed proposing that it should be immediate, but foreseeing a resurrection of the Presbyterian influence and other evils from the Bill for a New Representative, and resolved therefore that there should be a Dissolution without the Bill. Motives under the surface on both sides are suggested copiously enough by contemporary chroniclers and by subsequent historians. To Vane and most of the Republicans, we are told, Cromwell's personal preeminence in the Commonwealth, abnormal and alarming ever since the Battle of Worcester, had become more and more alarming with the evidences they had of his ambition after the actual sovereignty. They had always been studying the abatement of his power, and the war with the Dutch had at last come most conveniently. Was not Blake rising into renown as a rival to Cromwell; were not Blake's sea-battles of the present more in the public mind than Cromwell's land-battles of the past; by a development of the Navy, and a cautious transfer into it of officers and men from the Army, might not the way be prepared for an entire new-modelling of the military system and a reduction of Cromwell's Lord-Generalship to safer dimensions? At all events, what better time for a Dissolution than in the midst of the successes of the Dutch war, when the Rump was popular and might command the elections? And, if these were the secret considerations of the majority of the Rump, what but the reverse could be Cromwell's? He had watched Blake's rise, it was hinted, and did not altogether like the phenomenon. If he meant to strike at all in his own interests, was not the time now, when his Lord-Generalship was yet intact, and the leading of things towards the Navy at the expense of the Army had not gone too far? Above all, ought he to permit an appeal to the country at a moment when Blake's victories, and the necessity of ending the Dutch war by more of them, would be used as the electioneering cries of Vane and the Rump?[1]

---

[1] Commons Journals of dates given.

From such unsatisfactory conjecture or imagination of motives let us return to simple narrative:—The Bill had been last before the House on Wednesday, April 13, and it was to come on again on Wednesday, April 20. Between the two Wednesdays Cromwell and his friends made a final effort towards an agreement. They implored one more meeting with the active chiefs of the Rump. It could not be arranged for an earlier day than Tuesday the 19th of April; but on that day about twenty of the Parliament men, "none of the least in consideration for their interest and ability"—Whitlocke, Widdrington, and St. John, among them—did meet with Cromwell and his officers in Cromwell's house in Whitehall. Cromwell, for himself and his officers, having again stated their objections to the Bill and their belief that their own "lives, estates, and families," and the "Honest Interest" of the nation, were imperilled by it, the question suddenly narrowed itself. The leaders of the Rump, producing their last card, hinted apparently that, if the Bill for a new Representative were to be dropped, then no dissolution at all, but the continuance of the existing Rump, was the only possible policy. Divining the meaning of this hint, which was perhaps, on the part of some, merely *in terrorem* in behalf of the Bill, but on the part of others, such as Whitlocke and Widdrington, expressed what was really wanted, Cromwell begged leave to propound a different expedient, which had occurred to himself and the officers. It was that the House, dissolving itself immediately, and dropping the Bill for a new Parliament, should entrust the whole charge of the Commonwealth in the meantime, including arrangements for a future Parliament, to a select Council of some forty "Well-Affected men," not unlike the actual Council of State, but not necessarily composed of the same persons. This, Cromwell told them, "was no new thing when this land was under the like hurly-burlies." The Parliament-men present did not doubt that there were precedents, but saw many objections, especially in the matter of raising money, and on the whole went back stiffly upon their own plan of a continuance of the present Parliament. Cromwell pointed out how money could be raised, and still insisted on his expedient as, in all respects, "five times better than theirs." It was now late at night, and all that the Parliament-men could say was that they would sleep upon the proposals made and consult some friends. Two or three of the chief of them also promised, at parting, that they would "endeavour to suspend farther proceedings about their Bill" till there had been another conference.[1]

---

[1] Godwin, III. 446—450; Carlyle, II. 327—328; Guizot, I. 347—349; Scobell's Official Statement for Cromwell of April 21, 1653 (*Parl. Hist.* III. 1381—2); Cromwell's own Declaration of April 22 (*Ibid.* 1386—1390); Cromwell's Speech, July 4, 1653 (Carlyle, II. 341—345); Ludlow, 447—454; Bisset's *History of the Commonwealth*, II. 410—475; Memoirs of Col. Hutchinson (ed. 1808), pp. 332—333. Godwin, Carlyle, Guizot, and others, are at one in the statement that the Bill continued the Rump without re-election, and provided that the elections on new writs for the residue of the seats should be under the supervision of a Committee of the Rump. Scobell's words imply the same: "By the said Act these present members were to sit and to be made up by others chosen and by themselves approved of." Cromwell's words in his Declaration and subsequent Speech are consistent with the same account of the Bill, though not so particular. "The making use thereof [i. e. of the Bill] to recruit and so perpetuate themselves," is a phrase of the Declaration; and there are similar phrases in the Speech. Mr. Bisset, however, challenges this tradition as to the nature of the Bill. He finds no proof whatever that it provided for the continuance of the Rump without re-election, or was a Bill in any sense for the mere recruiting of the Rump; and he thinks that it was Cromwell's craft that spread about that account of the Bill, though he cautiously avoided words absolutely vouching in his own name the exact items of that account as given by Scobell. Mr. Bisset's chief argument is that Cromwell, into whose possession the only copy of the Bill came, could easily have published it, and would have published it had the publication been to his advantage. As he never did so, and the document utterly disappeared from mortal sight in his hands, what are we to infer but that it was nothing like the description of it he had favoured and circulated? In answer to this we may cite the natural likelihood of the case. We may agree with Godwin, who seems to have thought it the most natural thing in the world that the Bill should have been of the kind described, and not to have seen how the Rump, if in its senses, could possibly have ventured on a Bill of absolute self-dissolution on mere chance of re-election. But may we not turn Mr. Bisset's own argument the other way? Though the Bill had not been printed or engrossed, were there not plenty of people who knew exactly what it was and could have given a summary of it? Why was no such authenticated summary forthcoming if Cromwell's representation of the Bill, or Scobell's representation of it for Cromwell, was a positive falsehood? There was no difficulty in printing such things at the moment, or even afterwards, in Cromwell's life-time; and, though one can find ample reason why Cromwell should not publish the Bill apart from the supposition that he had lied about it, one can find no reason why his opponents should have refrained from publishing an abstract of it apart from the supposition that Cromwell's account of it was substantially accurate. Mr. Bisset refers to passages in Ludlow and Col. Hutchinson's memoirs as contradicting that account; but they are too general to be worth anything. Is it beyond hope that the Bill itself, or some authentic abstract of it, may yet be recovered?

---

[1] Cromwell's First Speech (Carlyle, II. 345—347); Whitlocke, under date April 20.

Next morning (April 20) Whitlocke was again at Cromwell's lodgings, where he found Cromwell and "but a few Parliament-men and a few officers of the Army" in resumed consultation. Meanwhile the House had met, and some of those whose presence had been again expected by Cromwell had preferred to go to the House. Others, who had come to the consultation, had also left for the House, when suddenly word was brought to those that remained that the Bill for a New Representative was actually on in the House, and that they were hurrying it through as fast as possible. Cromwell would not at first believe it; but, the message having been repeated, he rose, and hastened off from Whitehall to the House, in his "plain black clothes with grey worsted stockings," only giving some orders by the way. What he meant to do was unknown even to himself: what actually happened seems to have been ascertained most minutely afterwards by Ludlow. His account is as follows:—"He sat down and heard the debate for some "time. Then, calling to Major-General Harrison, who was "on the other side of the House, to come to him, he told him "that he judged the Parliament ripe for a dissolution and this "to be the time for doing it. The Major-General answered, "as he since told me, 'Sir, the work is very great and dan"gerous: therefore I desire you seriously to consider of it "before you engage in it.' '*You say well,*' replied the "General, and thereupon sat still for about a quarter of an "hour. Then, the question for passing the Bill being to be "put, he said to Major-General Harrison '*This is the time:* "*I must do it,*' and, suddenly standing up, made a speech. "Wherein he loaded the Parliament with the vilest reproaches, "charging them not to have a heart to do anything for the "public good, to have espoused the corrupt interest of Presby"tery and the Lawyers, who were the supporters of tyranny "and oppression,— accusing them of an intention to per"petuate themselves in power . . .;[1] and thereupon told them

---

[1] As the words of Ludlow omitted here, for reasons of symmetry, form one of the passages on which Mr. Bisset relies for his view of the nature of the Bill (see previous note, p. 409), it is right that I should quote them. "Accusing them of an intention to perpetuate themselves in power, *had they not been forced to the passing of this Act, which he affirmed they designed never to observe,*"

“that the Lord had done with them, and had chosen other
“instruments for the carrying on His work that were more
“worthy. This he spoke with so much passion and discom-
“posure of mind as if he had been distracted. Sir Peter
“Wentworth stood up to answer him, and said that this
“was the first time that ever he heard such unbecoming
“language given to the Parliament, and that it was the more
“horrid in that it came from their servant, and their servant
“whom they had so highly trusted and obliged. But, as he
“was going on, the General stepped into the midst of the
“House; where, continuing his distracted language, he said
“‘*Come, come: I will put an end to your prating.*’ Then, walk-
“ing up and down the House like a madman, and kicking the
“ground with his feet, he cried out, ‘*You are no Parliament;*
“*I say you are no Parliament; I will put an end to your sitting;*
“*call them in, call them in.*’ Whereupon the sergeant attend-
“ing the Parliament opened the doors; and Lieutenant-
“Colonel Wolseley, with two files of musketeers, entered the
“House; which Sir Henry Vane observing from his place
“said aloud ‘This is not honest; yea, it is against morality and
“common honesty.’ Then Cromwell fell a-railing at *him*,
“crying out with a loud voice ‘*O Sir Henry Vane, Sir Henry*
“*Vane, the Lord deliver me from Sir Henry Vane!*’ Then,
“looking to one of the members, he said ‘*There sits a*
“*drunkard*’; and, giving much reviling language to others
[e. g. ‘*And you are whoremongers,*’ addressed to Henry Marten
and Sir Peter Wentworth], he commanded the mace to be
“taken away, saying “*What shall we do with this Bauble?*
“*there, take it away.*’ He having brought all into this dis-
“order, Major-General Harrison went to the Speaker as he
“sat in the Chair, and told him that, seeing things were
“reduced to this pass, it would not be convenient for him

---

is the complete phrase; and it certainly argues a peculiar notion of the Bill in Ludlow's mind at the time he wrote. As he was in Ireland when the Bill was before the House, his knowledge of it must have been derivative; but that he did know it to be an Act for a New Representative according to a Reformed System of Constituencies appears from a previous passage of his Memoirs (435—6). Throughout the present passage, however, he speaks of it as a “Bill for Dissolution” only, letting go the recollection that it was also a “Bill for a New Representative.” It was certainly not to the “Dissolution” part of the Bill that Cromwell objected.

"to remain there. The Speaker answered that he would not "come down unless he were forced. 'Sir,' said Harrison, "'I will lend you my hand;' and thereupon, putting his hand "within his, the Speaker came down. Then Cromwell applied "himself to the members of the House . . . and said to them "'*It's you that have forced me to this, for I have sought the Lord* "*night and day that he would rather slay me than put me on the* "*doing of this work.*' Hereupon Alderman Allen, a member "of Parliament, told him that it was not yet gone so far but "all things might be restored again, and that, if the soldiers "were commanded out of the House and the mace returned, "the public affairs might go on in their former course; but "Cromwell, having now passed the Rubicon, not only rejected "his advice, but charged him with an account of some "hundred thousand pounds, for which he threatened to "question him, he having been long Treasurer of the Army, "and in a rage committed him to the custody of one of the "musketeers . . . [Then] Cromwell . . . ordered the House to "be cleared of all the members . . .; after which he went to "the Clerk, and, snatching the Act of Dissolution, which was "ready to pass, out of his hand, he put it under his cloak, "and, having commanded the doors to be locked up, went "away to Whitehall."[1]

There were about fifty-three persons in the House when it was thus turned out.[2] In the afternoon a few of those that were of the Council of State, including Bradshaw, Hasilrig, Scott, and Love, tried to hold a meeting as usual in that capacity. Cromwell stopped that too. Appearing among them, with Lambert and Harrison, he told them that, if they were sitting as private persons, they were welcome to do so, but that, after what had taken place in the morning, they must not consider themselves any longer a Council of State. Bradshaw, who seems to have been put into the chair for the occasion, is said to have behaved with due dignity. He protested that Parliament was not dissolved, inasmuch as it could be dissolved by no power under Heaven but its own act; and, several others having spoken briefly to the same effect, the meeting broke up. The next day a paper was found, posted up by somebody in the night, on the door of the Parliament house, with these words—

---

[1] Cromwell's First Speech, *ut supra;* Whitlocke, April 20, 1653; Ludlow's Memoirs (1698), pp. 455—458.

[2] Ludlow says "between 80 and 100"; which is utterly inconsistent with the records of numbers in the Journals of the House itself for months before. Cromwell's own statement is "not above 53," and may be absolutely trusted.

"THIS HOUSE TO BE LET, NOW UNFURNISHED."

CHAPTER VIII.

MILTON'S LIFE AND SECRETARYSHIP FROM DEC. 1651 TO APRIL 1653.

LETTER TO HERMANN MYLIUS: REMOVAL OF MILTON AND HIS FAMILY, IN DEC. 1651, FROM WHITEHALL TO PETTY FRANCE, WESTMINSTER: THE NEW HOUSE AND ITS NEIGHBOURHOOD: EXTRACTS RELATING TO MILTON FROM THE COUNCIL ORDER BOOKS FROM DEC. 1651 TO APRIL 1652: WECKHERLIN BROUGHT IN AS TEMPORARY ASSISTANT TO MILTON IN THE LATIN SECRETARYSHIP: DEATH OF MR. GUALTER FROST, THE GENERAL SECRETARY TO THE COUNCIL, AND APPOINTMENT OF MR. JOHN THURLOE TO BE HIS SUCCESSOR: MILTON'S BLINDNESS COMPLETE ABOUT APRIL 1652: HIS EXPECTATION OF THE CALAMITY AND PREPARATIONS FOR IT: ARRANGEMENT OF HIS OFFICIAL DUTIES TO SUIT: END OF HIS CENSORSHIP OR SUPERINTENDING EDITORSHIP OF THE *MERCURIUS POLITICUS*: TWO MORE ANTI-MILTONIC PAMPHLETS BELONGING TO THE SALMASIAN CONTROVERSY: AFFAIR OF THE RACOVIAN CATECHISM: THE SONNET TO CROMWELL AND THE SONNET TO VANE: PRECISE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THESE SONNETS: RESUMPTION OF SECRETARIAL WORK BY MILTON: EXTRACTS RELATING TO HIM FROM THE COUNCIL ORDER BOOKS FROM JULY 1652 TO APRIL 1653, WITH NOTICES OF BRIAN WALTON, HAAK, DURIE, NEEDHAM, MR. JOHN PELL, AND OTHERS: DURIE'S FRENCH TRANSLATION OF THE *EIKONOKLASTES*: FARTHER MODIFICATION OF

MILTON'S SECRETARYSHIP AND TRANSFERENCE OF PART OF THE DUTY TO THURLOE: LETTER TO THE GREEK LEONARD PHILARAS: NO APPEARANCE YET OF SALMASIUS HIMSELF IN REPLY TO MILTON: PUBLICATION AT THE HAGUE OF THE *REGII SANGUINIS CLAMOR*: ACCOUNT OF THAT INVECTIVE AGAINST MILTON, WITH SPECIMENS: ALEXANDER MORUS REPUTED TO BE THE AUTHOR: ANTECEDENTS OF MORUS: HIS CONNEXION WITH SALMASIUS: SCANDAL ABOUT MORUS: GOSSIP ON THE SUBJECT FROM THE VOSSIUS-HEINSIUS CORRESPONDENCE: THE PRINTER ADRIAN ULAC AND HIS OVERTURES TO MILTON: DEATH OF MILTON'S WIFE: LETTER TO RICHARD HEATH: JOHN PHILLIPS'S *RESPONSIO AD APOLOGIAM ANONYMI CUJUSDAM* IN BEHALF OF HIS UNCLE: ACCOUNT OF THE PAMPHLET: MORE GOSSIP ABOUT SALMASIUS, MORUS, AND MILTON, FROM THE VOSSIUS-HEINSIUS CORRESPONDENCE: HEINSIUS IN ITALY: ANDREW MARVELL AND HIS FIRST ACQUAINTANCE WITH MILTON: LETTER FROM MILTON TO BRADSHAW, RECOMMENDING MARVELL FOR THE ASSISTANT LATIN SECRETARYSHIP: FAILURE OF THE PROPOSAL: INVENTORY OF MILTON'S LATIN STATE LETTERS CONTINUED (NOS. XX—XL): CORRESPONDENCE WITH ANDREW SANDELANDS IN SCOTLAND.

AT the date at which we left Milton (Dec. 1651) he was still in those official lodgings in the Scotland Yard end of Whitehall which he had entered in Nov. 1649, and in which the Council of State had continued him, in spite of attempts that had been made to remove him. The business of his peculiar Secretaryship was becoming decidedly more onerous in consequence of the increase of the foreign correspondence of the Commonwealth, and he was surrounded by foreigners who had occasion to see him officially, or who liked to cultivate the acquaintance of the man who had beaten Salmasius. The following letter of Milton's, printed among his *Epistolæ Familiares*, and which we translate from the Latin, will enable us to resume the thread of his life from that point:—

To Hermann Mylius, Agent for the Count of Oldenburg.

"Before I reply, most noble Hermann, to your letter to me of the 17th of December, I must first of all, lest you should perchance consider me the person responsible for so long a silence, explain why I did not reply sooner. Understand then that a first cause of delay was, what is now almost a perpetual enemy of mine, bad health; next, on account of my health, there was a sudden and unavoidable removal to another house, and I had begun the same, as it chanced, on the very day on which your letter was brought me; finally, in truth, I was ashamed at then having nothing to report on your business that I thought would be agreeable to you. For, when, the day after, I met Mr. Frost accidentally, and carefully enquired of him whether any answer was yet under resolution for you (for, in my invalid state, I was often myself absent from the Council), he told me, and with some concern, that nothing was yet under resolution, and that he was having no success in his efforts to expedite the affair. I thought it better, therefore, to be silent for a time than to write at once what I knew would be annoying to you, and this in the expectation of afterwards being able to write, with full satisfaction, what *I* wanted to write and *you* so much desired. To-day, as I hope, I have brought things to a conclusion; for, after I had in the Council once and again reminded the President of your business, he reported it immediately, and with such effect that to-morrow is appointed for the consideration of an answer to be given to you as speedily as possible. I thought that, if I were the first, as was my purpose, to give you this information, you would be greatly pleased and it would also be a sign of my regard for you.

Westminster . . . ."

The Hermann Mylius here addressed was that envoy to the Commonwealth from the German Count of Oldenburg of whom we have already twice had a glimpse. Though he had been in London as early as August 1651, when Christopher Arnold was so much with him and was perhaps indebted to him for his introduction to Milton, his letters of credence, as we have seen (ante p. 379), had not been presented to the Parliament till October 15. The business on which he had come, and which had been referred, in the usual form, to the Council of State, had reappeared in the House, we may now add, on the authority of the *Commons Journals*, on the 26th of

November, on report from the Council through Lord Commissioner Whitlocke, and it had been referred back to the Council. Five days afterwards the new Council of State for the Fourth Year of the Commonwealth came into office, so that it was on this Council of the Fourth Year that the business came to depend. What *was* the business? Briefly, it was that the Count of Oldenburg wanted to be on good terms with the English Commonwealth, and had sent Mylius to solicit for him a kind of commercial treaty or alliance. The business, it appears, had been put off by the Council, and Mylius had been growing impatient. Hence, either because he was leaving town on some little excursion, or because some other reason made communication by letter convenient at the time, he had written to Mr. Secretary Milton, as his private friend, begging him to do what he could. Milton had received the letter on the 17th of December, or a day or two after; but, for the reasons he mentions, he had not favoured Mylius with a reply till ———. The date is blank in the reply itself, but will be fixed presently. We have quoted the Letter at this point because it fixes a date more important than that of its own dispatch.

On the 17th of December, 1651, it seems, Milton, on account of his constant ill-health, was in the act of removing from his Scotland Yard apartments to another residence, hastily taken. That it was in Westminster we infer from his letter to Mylius; but we have other means of knowing much more about it.

Phillips, who mentions the removal from Scotland Yard, dating it vaguely in 1652, and professing uncertainty whether the change was for reasons of health only, or for others as well, describes the new house as "a pretty garden-house, in "Petty France in Westminster, next door to the Lord Scuda-"more's, and opening into St. James's Park." The house still exists, and is, I believe, the only one of Milton's various London residences now left. Whoever chooses to seek out the present house known as No. 19, York Street, Westminster, may behold in that tenement the actual house in which Milton wrote the foregoing letter to Mylius, and which he and his were to inhabit for the next eight years. But what a difference between its present look and environment and its old look and environment as suggested by Phillips's description! What is now "York Street, Westminster," in dim commemoration of the fact that his grace, John Sharp, Archbishop of York, had his town-house thereabouts in the beginning of the last century, is a mean and dingy street of closely-packed houses and small shops, parallel indeed to the fine "Bird-Cage Walk" on the south side of St. James's Park, but separated from the Park and the very sight of its grass and trees by clumps of intervening buildings. No. 19 in that street, with a squalid shop in its lower part, and a recess on one side of it used for stacking wood, is of even less inviting aspect from the street than some of its neighbours. The frontage to the street, which is oldish, but with signs of modern doing-up, is narrow. If you enter (which you do by a small door and passage at the side of the shop), you have to grope up a dark staircase to the rooms that were once all Milton's, but are now let out among various tenants. As the tradition of Milton still survives in the house, a little enquiry at one or two shabby doors on the staircase, to be followed by a shilling or so, will admit you to as many of the rooms as you want to see. The larger ones on the first floor are not so bad; and it will occur to you, as you survey them, that what are now the back-rooms of the whole house may have been even pleasant and elegant in the old times when the house had a garden of its own behind it, and that garden opened directly into the Park. If you then descend, in quest of traces of this garden and its access to the Park, you will find only a small stone-flagged bit of yard, and a high wall, with vast building beyond, blocking off all view of what must have been the rest of the stretch of the garden. The more antique character of the brick house, however, as seen from this flagged yard at the back, suggests distinctly that its aspect from the Park, and the approach to it from the Park, were once more important than its present York Street frontage; and, with this impression in one's mind, and remembering that the whole skirt of the Park by Bird-Cage Walk, now densified into York Street and its purlieus, was once the airy and favourite neighbourhood called "Petty France," one can hew gaps in fancy to the right and left of the house as it stands, inserting shrubbery and garden-palings *ad libitum*, and so have a sufficient vision of a row of villas freshly built hereabouts in 1651, and of this old house as then one of them. If any doubts should linger after all whether such a house can have really once sufficed for Milton, they may be set at rest by a mural tablet, visible near one of the upper back-windows, and bearing the inscription "SACRED TO MILTON, PRINCE OF POETS." The tablet was put there by Jeremy Bentham, who was landlord of the house, and whose own house in Queen Anne Square, Westminster, where he spent the last fifty years of his life, was all but contiguous. From 1811 onwards, after the tablet on Milton's house had been set up, Bentham's tenant in it, inhabiting the whole house as Milton did, was William Hazlitt.[1]

The Lord Scudamore mentioned by Phillips as next-door neighbour to Milton in his new house was the same who had, fourteen years before, been co-ambassador with the Earl of Leicester for Charles I. at the Court of France, and had in that capacity been so kind to Milton—procuring him an introduction to Grotius and showing him other attentions, as he passed through Paris on his way to Italy.[2] Times had changed for peers like him; but there may have been a renewal of the acquaintance. More interesting it is to think of the daily walk there would now be for Milton, when he was able to go out at all, between his new house and the Council. Whoever will spend a few moments any afternoon in going from Queen Anne Gate in Bird-Cage Walk through the Park, by the ornamental water, to the Horse Guards or Spring Gardens, and so into Whitehall, may be sure that he is tracking the exact half-mile or so of London ground that now became most familiar to Milton's feet, and over which he was to pass backwards and forwards, often and often, through the remaining eight years of his Secretaryship. The ornamental water was not then there, nor was there such regular railing and laying out as we now behold, but only open grass, with trees and some ponds.

---

[1] Phillips's Memoir of Milton; Cuningham's Handbook of London, Articles "York Street, Westminster," and "Queen Square, Westminster"; Hazlitt's *Spirit of the Age* (1825), pp. 5—6; and my own visits to the House and its neighbourhood. Bentham, though he cherished Milton's memory in connexion with the house, is said by Hazlitt to have been responsible for the encroachments on its garden-ground at the back, for the purposes of a "Chrestomathic School" he had designed in extension of his Queen Square premises.—Between the writing and the printing of the paragraph in the text it has ceased to correspond with fact. Observing great building operations going on in the neighbourhood, threatening the little tenement, I ventured to inquire, in a letter printed in the *Times* of Oct. 22, 1875, whether something might not be done to preserve it in some suitable form. I have reason to believe that the suggestion reached the proprietor, who was also the promoter of the neighbouring building operations, and that it was seriously entertained by him. He could not, I must now assume, reconcile it with possibilities or with his interests; for, on my last visit to the spot, in October 1876, I found only the dismantled shell of the house standing, and early in March 1877, as I learn from the newspapers, even that was swept away. Milton's house in Petty France, therefore, exists now only in memory, and can be visited no more. Instead of cancelling or re-writing the paragraph, however, I have kept it as originally written.

[2] Vol. I. pp. 701—703.

As before, we shall follow the incidents of Milton's Secretaryship best by noting and explaining them as they occur in the Council Order Books:—

Monday, Dec. 29, 1651 :—Eighteen members of the Council were present, and Blake among them. Lord Commissioner Whitlocke was appointed President of the Council for the coming month, according to the rule of Parliament which had abolished the permanent Presidency; and then various orders were passed. One of them was "That MR. MILTON be continued Secretary for Foreign Tongues "to this Council for this year to come."

Thursday, Jan. 1, 1651–2 :—Whitlocke in the chair and twenty-three other members present, but neither Cromwell nor Blake. "*Mem.* MR. MILTON did this day take the oath of secrecy."

In connexion with these two entries, one notes that a whole month of the new Council for the Fourth Year had already elapsed. The first meeting of the Council, with no fewer than twenty-nine present, had been on the 1st of December; Bradshaw had been President during the intervening month; the standing Committees of the Council had been re-appointed; the younger Frost and other servants of the Council had been sworn in afresh to their offices; Hugh Peters, Sterry, and Caryl, had been continued as preachers to the Council, with the same salaries; there had even been a good deal of business in Milton's special department, including meetings of a special committee appointed "to consider of the manner of giving audience to public ministers of Foreign Princes" and to confer with Sir Oliver Fleming on the subject. The three Dutch ambassadors-extraordinary had begun their negotiations with the Council; the Swedish minister was at their doors; the Spanish ambassador had this or that to say to them; one knows not how many other other foreign agents, besides Hermann Mylius, were waiting for replies. Yet all this while Milton had been away from his post. He had once, in the interval, on or about the 18th of December, as we learn from his letter to Mylius, met Mr. Frost in the street or in the Park, and had some talk with him about the business of the office; he may have been doing odds and ends of Council work at home; but the state of his health had prevented his personal attendance till Jan. 1, 1651–2, when he reappeared to be sworn in.

Friday, Jan. 2:—That MR. MILTON do prepare a Letter "in Latin, of the substance of what was now here read in "English, to be sent to the Duke of Tuscany: to be brought to "the Council to be there read for the approbation of the Council." Since the 15th of October, it appears from the Commons Journals, a Letter from the Grand Duke of Tuscany to the Parliament, which had been referred to the Council, had remained unanswered. The Duke's agent, Amerigo Salvetti (ante p. 379), therefore, had been waiting exactly as long as the Count of Oldenburg's agent, Mylius. Now, however, an answer has been drafted, and Milton is to translate it into Latin. This translation was approved, and duly reported to Parliament; for the Journals show that on the 20th of January it was ordered to be signed by the Speaker and despatched to the Duke, while a separate letter, to be signed by the Clerk of the Parliament, was to be sent to Salvetti.

Friday, Jan. 23:—"That MR. MILTON do make a translate of the "Paper this day sent in to the Council from the Lords Ambassadors "for the High and Mighty Lords the States General of the United "Provinces; which the Committee for Foreign Affairs are to take "into consideration, and prepare an answer thereto, to be reported "to the Council." The difficult negotiations between the Council and the three Dutch ambassadors, Catz, Schaep, and Van de Perre, are now in full course; the ambassadors have sent in a Latin paper; and the Council and their Committee would be able to consider it better in English.

Monday, Jan. 26:—"That MR. MILTON do translate into Latin "the Answer of the Council to the First Paper of the Lords "Ambassadors of the United Provinces, containing three Articles."

This is not the Paper received the preceding Friday and which Milton was to translate out of the Latin, but a prior Paper, to which the answer was ready.

Tuesday, Jan. 27 :—"That a warrant be issued to the Sergeant "at Arms to repair to the house of WILLIAM DUGARD, printer, and "there to make seizure of a certain impression of books entitled *Cate-"chesis Ecclesiarum Poloniæ,* and to require him to come forthwith to "the Council." Dugard, we find, from subsequent entries, *was* brought before the Council, and was under examination for some time. What was his offence? Actually he had printed, for sale in England, an edition of what was known as "The Racovian Catechism," i.e. that Catechism, published in Polish at Rakow in the year 1605, and extant also in Latin since 1609, in which Smalcius and Moskorzewski, two Anti-Trinitarian divines, had carried into effect a design of the younger Socinus by reducing to systematic form the whole body of Socinian doctrine. For more than a century Poland had been the head-quarters of an Anti-Trinitarian theology; the writings of Servetus had taken wide effect there; and there had been a secret academy or society at Cracow for the perpetuation of the Anti-Trinitarian belief, and the conversion of Polish Protestantism, if possible, into distinct Unitarianism. The visits to Poland of the Italian Lælius Socinus in 1551 and 1556, and the residence in Poland from 1579 to 1604 of his nephew Faustus Socinus, had but developed and intensified this tendency of Polish Protestantism; and the Racovian Catechism, or Catechism of the Socinian Churches of Poland, was, in fact, the manifesto of all the diffused and struggling Anti-Trinitarianism of Europe. Whether from sympathy with its views, or merely in the interests of literary curiosity and free discussion, Dugard, the Council of State's own printer, had passed an English edition of it through his press; and for this he was now in trouble. MILTON, as we shall see, though the present Council minute does not mention him, was mixed up with the affair.

Wednesday, Jan. 28 :—Hasilrig was now President of the Council, and sixteen more members were present, Cromwell one of them. *Ordered,* "That the Paper now read, in answer to the Paper from "the Dutch Ambassadors, sent by them to the Council on the 23rd "instant, be passed and approved of; and MR. MILTON is to trans-"late it into Latin, in order to be signed by the Lord President "of the Council."

Wednesday, Feb. 11 :—"That the copy of the Safeguard this day "read, to be granted to the Count of Oldenburg, be approved of; "That the copy of the said Safeguard be translated into Latin by "MR. MILTON, and brought by him to the Lord Commissioner "Whitlocke and Mr. Neville, to be perused by them"; also, "That "the copy of the Safeguard prepared by the Council to be given to "the Count of Oldenburg be humbly reported to the Parliament for "their approbation if they shall think fit; and the translate of it "into Latin is to be sent along with it; and the Lord Commissioner

"Whitlocke is desired to make this report."—Here at last is the good news for Mylius, and the means of dating Milton's letter to him. The day before, or a day or two before, Milton had, in some persistent manner, as he himself tells us, reminded the President of the Council, i.e. Hasilrig, of the long-delayed affair of the Count of Oldenburg, and with such effect that he had been able to write to Mylius that the affair was as good as settled. And now it was really settled. For, when Whitlocke did report the Safeguard, both in Latin and English, to the House on the 17th of February, the House, as the Journals of that day record, passed it as it stood, and ordered it to be sealed with the seal of the Parliament, and signed by the Speaker. At the same time they approved of a draft letter in English, read by Whitlocke, which the Council proposed to send to the Count along with the Safeguard, and they ordered the Council to have the letter translated into Latin for the purpose. The duty, of course, fell to Milton. Among his Latin letters of State is one "*Comiti Oldenburgico*," signed by Henry Scobell, as Clerk of the Parliament, which is quite undated both in the printed editions and in the Skinner Transcript of Milton's Letters in the Record Office; but is certainly the Letter so ordered by Parliament, Feb. 17, 1951–2, and may be dated henceforth accordingly. The Safeguard which accompanied the Letter does not appear among the preserved Milton Letters, either in print or in MS.; but, if I mistake not, it is the document printed in Thurloe, I. 385–6 (undated and out of its place), beginning "*Universis et singulis*," &c., and granting "to the Most Serene and High Prince, Lord Frederick, heir of Norway, Duke of Sleswig, Holstia, Ditmarsh, &c., Count in Oldenburg and Delmenhorst," the safeguard and rights of neutrality which he had desired for his subjects. That document, therefore, may henceforth be added, if desired, to the Collection of Milton's State Letters.

Wednesday, March 3:—Viscount Lisle is now President of the Council. *Ordered*, "That the Letter now read, which is prepared to "be sent to the Queen of Sweden along with the Agent intended to "be sent thither, be humbly represented to the Parliament; and "the Lord Commissioner Whitlocke is desired to do it accordingly; "and that the copy of this letter be translated into Latin." This is the letter of condolence, &c., to Queen Christina, after the death of her public minister Silvercron in London (ante pp. 377–8). The House had ordered the Council to prepare such a Letter, Feb. 25; and, when Milton's Letter had been read in the House, March 11, it was sealed and signed by the Speaker. It is among Milton's State Letters.

Monday, March 8:—"That so many of the Articles as are "already passed [Articles to be offered to the Dutch Ambassadors] "be sent to Mr. Milton, to be translated into Latin."

Tuesday, March 9:—Two orders of interest to Milton this day. One was that the translation of the Articles for the Dutch Ambassadors, ordered the day before, should be ready by "Thursday "next in the afternoon," i.e. within two days. As the Articles were in answer to thirty-six Articles of the Dutch Ambassadors, the task must have been rather heavy. Connect with this fact the other order of the same day,—"That it be referred to the "Committee for Foreign Affairs to take into consideration how "MR. WECKHERLIN may be employed by the Council in reference "to the business of foreign transactions."

Thursday, March 11:—"That MR. WECKHERLIN be appointed "Secretary Assistant for the business of Foreign Affairs"; and "That MR. WECKHERLIN shall have the sum of £200 per annum "allowed unto him in consideration of his being employed in this "business, which allowance is to be paid unto him quarterly by "Mr. Frost, as to the rest of the servants and persons employed by "this Council." There is no mistake about this. Milton was overtaxed with the increase of work; and the old German Weckherlin, who had been secretary to the former Derby House Committee of both Kingdoms, and who, in fact, might have looked for the Foreign Secretaryship to the Council when it was first given to Milton (ante p. 82), was brought in as Milton's assistant. The salary awarded him was worth about £700 a year now.

Monday, March 29, 1652:—Mr. Commissioner Lisle was now President of the Council; and there were these interesting orders:—"That MR. GUALTER FROST do continue in the same employment "and salary (£365 *per annum*, worth £1250 now), which he formerly "had, notwithstanding the death of his father; That the Lord President do humbly present the condition of Mr. Frost's family to the "Parliament." In continuation of these entries this follows:—"*Resolved*, That this Council do now proceed to take into consideration "the nominating of one to the Parliament to be Secretary to the "Council of State; *Resolved*, That MR. JOHN THURLOE be presented "to the Parliament to be Secretary in the room of Mr. Frost, late "Secretary to the Council of State."—And so Milton's colleague, MR. GUALTER FROST, SENIOR, who had been Chief or General Secretary to the Council of State from the beginning of the Republic, was now dead, and would be seen in Whitehall no more. The Council at once confirm his son, MR. GUALTER FROST, JUNIOR, in the appointment of Assistant General Secretary which he had held under his father; and they recommend the widow and the rest of the family to the generosity of the Parliament. The next day, accordingly (March 30), the Commons Journals show that the Parliament voted a donation of £1000 (worth about £3500 now), for distribution among the Frost family, authorizing the Council of State to consider what more could be done,—an authority which resulted in £200 more to the widow for funeral expenses, and in the bringing of several younger Frosts into the employment of the Council in various capacities. The House at the same time waived their right to appoint a successor to the late Mr. Frost, and referred it to the Council of State to "elect and choose such Clerk or Clerks for the service of the Council" as they might think fit.

The Council had fixed on the proper man to be Chief Clerk or Secretary. He was MR. JOHN THURLOE, of Lincoln's Inn, a *protegé* from his youth of St. John, by whose interest he had been made one of the Clerks or Secretaries to the Parliamentary Commissioners who treated with the King at Uxbridge in Jan. 1644–5, and by whose interest also he had obtained several subsequent posts, the last having been the Secretaryship to St. John's own Embassy, with Strickland, to the United Provinces (ante p. 276). He was now in his thirty-sixth year, eight years younger than Milton.

Tuesday, March 30 :—"That MR. THURLOE be nominated Clerk "to the Council in the place of Mr. Frost, their late Secretary; "That GUALTER FROST be Clerk-Assistant to the Council; That "Thursday next come sevennight the Council do take into consideration whether they will have any more than one Clerk to "the Council." In other words, though THURLOE was to be undoubtedly Chief Secretary, the organization of the office under him was to be a matter of further thought.

Wednesday, March 31 :—"That the Paper now prepared, to "be given in answer to the Spanish Ambassador, be approved, "translated, signed, and sent unto him; That MR. MILTON do "translate the said Paper out of English into Latin, to be sent "along as a copy."

Thursday, April 1 :—"That MR. THURLOE shall have after the "rate of £600 per annum for the time which is to come for the "sitting of this Council"; and "That convenient lodgings be "provided for MR. THURLOE in Whitehall." Thurloe's salary as yet was not to be quite equal to the late Mr. Frost's, which had been £730 a year (worth over £2500 now); but £600 a year (worth about £2100 now) was a very fair salary, and the accommodation in Whitehall was an addition of dignity.

Wednesday, April 7 :—"That the answer to the King of Denmark "now read be approved of, and translated into Latin by MR. "WECKHERLIN."

Monday, April 12 :—MR. THURLOE is allowed a fortnight's absence, to go into the country.—This means that, before settling in the General Secretaryship, he was to have a fortnight in Lincolnshire and the Fen districts, to wind up his private affairs there. It was here, I find, that he received a letter, dated April 13, from his patron, Chief Justice St. John (who, though of the Council, chanced to be also in the country at the time), partly congratulating him on his new appointment, partly regretting that St. John would now lose his private services. "I hear from Sir Henry Vane, and "otherwise," St. John wrote, "of your election into Mr. Frost's "place, with the circumstances. God forbid I should in the least "repine at any His works of Providence, much more at those "relating to your own good and the good of many. No, I bless "Him. As soon as I heard the news, in what concerned you "I rejoiced in it upon these grounds. No, go on and prosper; let "not your hands faint; wait upon Him in His ways; and He that "hath called you will cause His presence and blessing to go along "with you" (Thurloe, I. 205).

Thursday, April 15:—"That the Paper, now read, to be sent to "the Dutch Ambassadors, be approved of, and sent to MR. MILTON, "to be translated into Latin."—Through the rest of April, while Thurloe is in the country, there are other directions for the translation of diplomatic papers into Latin, without specification of the translator, whether MILTON or WECKHERLIN.

Clearly, in March and April 1652, a crisis had come in Milton's Secretaryship. Let us pause in our extracts from the Order Books, to understand the circumstances better.

Milton, absent from the Council on account of ill-health through the whole of December 1651, after a very irregular attendance on the same account during the preceding five months, had been able to resume active duty in January 1651–2. Through that month and part of the next he had persevered in his attendance. But the strain had been too great, and by the beginning of March he had again broken down. The minutes of work assigned to him during March and April bear that the necessary Papers had "*to be sent*" to him, i. e. taken to his house in Petty France by a messenger.[1] Hence the appointment, March 11, of Weckherlin to be his Assistant. Hardly had that appointment been made, however, when the death of Mr. Frost farther disturbed the routine of the Council by causing a vacancy in the General Secretaryship. Mr. Thurloe was appointed successor to Mr. Frost on the 30th of March, 1652, and must have made acquaintance with the Council in April; but not till May, on his return from the country, was he to step into his full official responsibility.

My belief is that the certainty of total blindness had now fallen on Milton, and that this, though not much talked of by himself, was known to the Council and pretty generally through London. He certainly was totally blind in the year 1652; and, though the date of the "totality" may, from the nature of the case, be assigned to a particular year more surely than to any particular month, March or April 1652 is the likeliest. Farther reasons for this belief will soon appear. Meanwhile we shall not be wrong in assuming that the new house in Petty France, into which Milton had entered in December 1651, had within a few months from that date all but ceased, both within and without, to be anything distinct to his vision. We have to imagine that now and henceforth he had to be led along its rooms and passages and into its garden, that the whole green neighbourhood had become a vague blank or blur to him, and that, whenever he did venture across the Park towards Whitehall, it had to be under guidance:—

---

[1] See entries of March 8 and April 15.

> "A little onward lend thy guiding hand
> To these dark steps, a little further on."

Blind, and in the forty-fourth year of one's age! What a fate! How, in this horror and disablement of darkness come upon a man in his prime, was he to work on at all any more in the world, how even to live? For Milton the question of mere continued livelihood and the support of his family was happily not a desperate one. At the worst, he could fall back on his frugal means before his Secretaryship, increased somewhat by his savings since; and, with his still young wife, and his children, he should even then be in modest comfort, or beyond poverty. No chance either that it should come to that. No chance that the Commonwealth, generous to all her servants, would forget what a champion of her cause and of her good fame Milton had been. If his *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates* and his *Eikonoklastes* could, by any supposition, be forgotten, was there not his *Defensio pro Populo Anglicano* against Salmasius, that absolute masterpiece of advocacy, by which, more than by anything else except the Battle of Worcester, the foreign world had been awakened to the claims and strength of the Commonwealth, and Kings and other Powers had been brought to it almost on their knees? He had refused all money-payment for it hitherto; but what reasonable pension now, if he would take it, would not the Commonwealth give? All this Milton knew; but still, but still! Blind at the age of forty-three!

All his intentions, all his projects, all his hopes of further activity and usefulness, turned into mere gropings through a future of blackness. His Secretaryship, to which he had been accustomed, the duties of which he had come to like, how, on any terms, could he give up that? Then, apart from his Secretaryship, the cutting short of his own cherished studies and the fond occupations of his life hitherto, his miscellaneous pursuit of knowledge, his commerce with the books he had gathered about him and with the libraries at hand, his unfinished controversies with rascal individuals or in behalf of glorious ideas, and all his schemes of more serene literary labour, from the completion of his *Dictionary of the Latin Tongue,* his *History of Britain,* and his *Digest of Theology from the Bible,* to the invention and achievement of his long-meditated Poem!

Things, we are bound to add, were not so bad as they might at first appear. The blindness, if some month or two in particular had at last decided it, had been coming on so long that Milton's habits had been adjusting themselves to the change. The matter is worth a little inquiry in detail.

The precious Volume of Milton MSS. in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge, containing the drafts of most of Milton's English Poems between 1630 and 1658, distinctly proves that even before 1648 he had occasionally employed amanuenses. Though nearly all before that date is in his own hand, there are scraps in other hands. At the same time the Volume proves as distinctly that to the end of 1648 he had perfect use of his hand for any ordinary piece of writing. The draft of the Sonnet to Fairfax, in August or September 1648, though it is the last piece in the Volume in Milton's own hand, is about as strong and bold a bit of his autograph as the volume contains. The hand there may well have carried him through his *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates,* written in 1648–9, and lasted him into his Secretaryship, begun in March 1648–9. Care for his fading eyesight may thenceforth have induced him, both in his official duties and for his own purposes, to do as much as possible, in the business of reading, through the eyes of others, and, in the business of writing, through the method of dictation. For writings and readings of importance and urgency, however, he could still trust to himself. The large manuscript of his *Eikonoklastes,* published in October 1649, may have been wholly or mainly in his own hand. Nay, when we come to the crucial case of the *Defensio pro Populo Anglicano contra Salmasium,* Milton's great labour through 1650, and not published till April 1651, the drift of the evidence still is that his own hand and eyes were painfully tasked over the actual pen and paper for that work too. His own references to the subject in the Preface to the work, and his subsequent references to it in the *Defensio Secunda* and in the Sonnet on his Blindness to Cyriack Skinner, distinctly attributing the acceleration of his blindness to his perseverance in that work in spite of the warnings of his physicians, all seem to require that literal interpretation; and there is a phrase in Phillips's Memoir to the same effect. Could the manuscript be recovered, it would possibly show an agonized combination of Milton's own hand and dictations to amanuenses.[1] But, between the publication of the *Defensio contra Salmasium* and the date at which we have now arrived (April 1652), there had elapsed a whole year; and it is through that year of rapidly hastening dimness of sight, and much continued ill-health besides, that we are to conceive Milton acquiring more and more the art of working through amanuenses, whether for his own studies and pursuits, or for his official documents for the Council.

For official documents and dictations Milton's customary amanuenses would, of course, be the paid clerks under him in

---

[1] According to M. A. Geffroy, in his interesting, and intelligent little work entitled *Étude sur les Pamphlets politiques et religieux de Milton* (Paris, 1848), the MS. of the *Defensio contra Salmasium* ought still to be extant. "Le MS." he says, "est entre les mains de Sir Francis Egerton." As he refers to Todd as his authority, however, and as I find that Todd, at the place indicated, only speaks of a particular printed copy of the Defensio "in Lord Francis Egerton's possession," I have the less hesitation in rejecting the good news given in M. Geffroy's book as to the present whereabouts of the original MSS. of others of Milton's Pamphlets. He says, for example, "Le manuscrit de l'Aréopagitica, ainsi que celui des petits Poëmes de Milton, est à Bibliothèque Bodléienne." I fear the Bodleian itself is not aware of the fact.—It is strange that the manuscripts of the Prose Pamphlets, forming such a mass altogether, and ranging from 1641 onwards for thirty years, should have so completely disappeared.

Whitehall. One or other of these could attend him in the Office itself, in some room near the Council Room, or could be told off, so long as Milton had his apartments in the same range of building, to attend him there. The strict secrecy studied and enjoined in the transaction of all Council business naturally confined Milton, in all that appertained to that business, to this use only of the sworn clerks of the office; and so, when he removed to Petty France, the difficulty may have been a little increased. Even then, however, there was nothing to prevent the daily despatch to Milton's house, when he could not attend himself, of a messenger with papers, or of a good clerk, and the return, that day or the next, of the writings wanted. Moreover, there was in Milton's house, independently, at least one person who could give him help. Possibly there were two such persons. His elder nephew, Edward Phillips, who had gone to Oxford in March 1648–9 to be a student in Magdalen College, had quitted that College, and the highly Puritan discipline of its new President, Dr. Thomas Goodwin, without taking his degree. He was back in London in 1651, at the age of twenty-one, in quest of teaching or of work for the booksellers; and it is as likely as not that his uncle's house was again, for a time, his home. There, at all events, did reside his younger brother, John Phillips, who had never left his uncle through all the previous changes of domicile since the old Aldersgate Street days, but had been built up in Latin and in all things else wholly by his uncle, without touch from any University. This young John Phillips, there is evidence, had become Milton's chief dependence in all such duties of consultation of books, reading aloud, and writing to dictation, as might belong to the private Secretary of a literary man of failing sight and infirm health. Nay, there is evidence that, after the removal to Petty France, if not previously in Whitehall, Phillips, by some tacit understanding between Milton and the office, was allowed to assist his uncle even in official papers and translations. As the young man really knew Latin and other tongues well, the arrangement was quite natural, and was probably intended to lead to the appointment of Phillips to a regular place in the office. Had he been old enough, it might not have been necessary to go out of the family for a fit assistant to Milton in his blindness.[1]

One can see, then, the arrangement the Council intended to make by calling in Weckherlin. Milton was to be continued in his office, with his full title of *Secretary for the Foreign Tongues*, and his full pay, as hitherto. Even if he had wanted to retire, which does not seem to have been the case, the Council could not part with his name and services. He could come to the office when he was able; and his presence would still be very desirable, when he could give it, at receptions of foreign ambassadors and agents by the Council and its Committees, or even at the stately Council dinners now and then given to such, and the weekly public table to which they and their *attachés* were welcome. But, for the rest, Mr. Weckherlin would be his deputy in the matter of daily personal attendance, and all Papers in which Mr. Milton's own hand, rather than Mr. Weckherlin's, was wanted, could be specially referred to Mr. Milton, and done at his house if he liked. There might be some inconvenience at first; but, once Mr. Thurloe was fairly settled in the General Secretaryship, all would be brought into working order.

Before resuming the story of Milton's Secretaryship under the new arrangement, let us see what incidents and events of his life generally, apart from his Secretaryship, affix themselves to the beginning of his residence in Petty France and to the first months of his total blindness.

The Censorship of Needham's newspaper, *Mercurius Politicus*, had been, as we saw, an employment assigned to Milton in Jan. 1650–1, as extra to his Secretaryship, and discharged by him, with some trouble, till December 1651. The employment continued, I have now to add, through December 1651 and January 1651–2; in which months I have noted eight more entries of successive numbers of the paper in the

---

[1] Wood's Ath. IV. 760; Godwin's Lives of the Phillipses, 12—20; Mr. Leigh Sotheby's *Ramblings in Elucidation of Milton's Autograph*, with facsimiles there.

Registers of Stationers' Hall in the customary form, "*Tho. Newcomb entered for his copy, under the hand of Mr. Milton, a pamphlet called Mercurius Politicus.*" In the entry for January 29, 1651–2, however, the words "under the hand of Mr. Milton" are dropped, and they do not occur again in any subsequent registration of the paper. Milton, therefore, had then ceased to license the paper, and the duty was managed by Mr. Frost,—from whom it descended, I find, to Mr. Thurloe. Milton's connexion with Needham, however, and possibly his concern with the paper, did not cease with his formal Censorship. Needham, who lived close to Milton in Westminster,[1] had become, as Wood phrases it, "a great crony" of his, and there are traces of the influence of this "cronyship" upon the paper long afterwards. To as late as August 1652, I have distinctly noted, the paper even retains those characteristics which Milton's concern in it may be imagined to have first occasioned, and which justify the supposition of some kind of controlling Editorship on his part. The palmy time of *Mercurius Politicus*, I can vouch, from a pretty continuous acquaintance with it from its first number to its last, over a period of nearly ten years, was between August 1650 and August 1652, when Milton's connexion with it for the whole two years is credible, and his Censorship of it for one year is certain.[2]

What of Salmasius and the Salmasian Controversy? Since the return of the great man from Sweden to Leyden in the end of 1651 there had been much observation of his movements, not only by Heinsius, Gronovius, Vossius, and other foreign scholars, in whose correspondence he was an eternal subject of gossip, but also, it appears, by correspondents of the London *Mercurius Politicus*. Thus, in the number for January 1, 1651–2, a Leyden correspondent, after informing the editor that Salmasius is undoubtedly in Leyden, "for I have seen and spoken with him," and after telling what attentions and rewards he had received in Sweden, and also from the King of Denmark on his passage through that country homewards, adds "Yet all this doth him no good, "because Milton's Reply lies as a raw undigested gobbet "upon his stomach: shortly now we shall see how far "he holds himself bound to take notice of the said Reply." Again, in the number for January 15, "Our Salmasius bites "his thumbs still in silence at Leyden, and gives out that he "scorns to give any answer to Milton; but the truth is, "I believe, he knows not how to salve those wounds and scars "that have been given him. He is now more haughty than "ever, and takes himself, I think, for some great Emperor." But, if Salmasius was idle or seemingly idle himself, others, as before, were stirring for him. Two new pamphlets, belonging to the Salmasian Controversy, have to be reported as following Milton, in rumour at least, into his house in Petty France. One was in English, the other in Latin.

---

[1] In the Registers of the parish of St. Margaret's, Westminster (Milton's parish), I find, under date May 6, 1652, the entry of the birth of "Marchamont Needham, son of Marchamont by Lucey."

[2] My notes from *Mercurius Politicus* (continuously from No. 1 to No. 157, and in selected numbers and batches afterwards, but often continuously over considerable periods); my notes from the Stationers' Registers; Wood's Fasti, I. 484.—A selection from that continuous series of leading articles on the theory of Republican politics which had been begun in the *Mercurius Politicus* at the close of 1650 (see ante, p. 329), and which ended, I find, in the number of the paper for Aug. 12, 1652, with a hint from the writer that they might be reprinted separately in a revised form, did so appear in an octavo, published June 29, 1656 by "Thomas Brewster, at the Three Bibles near the West End of Paul's," under the title, "*The Excellencie of a Free State, or The Right Constitution of a Commonwealth.*" The author is not named, but appears only as "A Well-wisher to Posterity." The book was reprinted in 1767 under the editorship of Richard Baron, and then naturally ascribed to Needham. Very probably the articles were all Needham's; but there is no absolute proof, and I can suppose some inspiration or superintendence of them by Milton, whoever was the writer. The special leader on the Battle of Worcester (ante, pp. 332—334) is not included.

Observations, concerning the Originall of Government, upon Mr. Hobs' Leviathan, Mr. Milton against Salmasius, H. Grotius De Jure Belli: such was the title of a pamphlet of fifty small quarto pages, "printed for R. Royston, at the Angel in Ivie Lane," which was out in London on the 18th of February, 1651–2.[1] It was anonymous, and was ascribed by some at the time to the Royalist and Episcopalian divine Dr. Henry Hammond, but was really by a certain Kentish baronet, Sir Robert Filmer, then a studious elderly gentleman not much known in the world, though he was to have a great subsequent celebrity as the propounder of that particular theory of Arbitrary Monarchy, called the theory of Patriarchal Government, which obtained such a footing in England after the Restoration, and which Algernon Sidney, Locke, and other liberal spirits, exerted themselves to confute. At our present date, he had already anonymously expounded his theory, or the substance of it, in at least two publications, of a quiet ratiocinative kind, both bearing date 1648—one entitled "The Anarchy of a Limited or Mixed Monarchy," and the other "The Necessity of the Absolute Power of all Kings, and in particular of the King of England;" and in this third publication his aim seems to have been to insinuate the same views still more gently in the loose and unpretending form of a few criticisms of the three books named on the title-page. It is a gentlemanlike tract, of an argumentative kind, without personality or virulence. The first twelve pages are given to Hobbes. "With no small content," says the author, "I "read Mr. Hobbes' Book *De Cive*, and his *Leviathan*, about "the rights of Sovereignty, which no man that I know hath "so amply and judiciously handled. I consent with him "about the rights of exercising Government, but I cannot "agree to his means of acquiring it. It may seem strange "I should praise his building and yet mislike his foundation; "but so it is. His *jus naturæ* and his *regnum institutivum* will "not down with me." After some argument with Hobbes, he passes to Milton, who occupies pages 13–24, the rest being given to Grotius, with some allusions to Selden. To Milton, sometimes named as "J. M.," sometimes as "Mr. M.," and sometimes as "Mr. Milton" in full, he is quite respectful, only quoting passages from the *Defensio* and the *Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, and objecting to their doctrine. Thus, asserting that the words "King" and "People," though the whole debate turned upon them, had never been properly defined, he says, "Ask Salmasius what a King is, and he will "teach us that a King is he who hath the supreme power of "the Kingdom, and is accountable to none but God, and may "do what he pleases, and is free from all laws. This definition "J. M. abominates, as being the definition of a Tyrant; and

---

[1] The imprint is "1652," but the Thomason copy gives the date Feb. 18, 1651, i.e. 1651—2. "By Hen. Hammond" is inserted in MS. in the title-page of the Thomason copy.

"I should be of his mind if he would have vouchsafed us a "better, or any other definition at all, that would tell us how "any King can have supreme power without being freed from "human laws." He tries nevertheless to "pick out" Milton's definition of a King from several passages read in context, and has less difficulty about Milton's definition of the People. "J. M. will not allow the major part of the representers to "be the People, but the sounder and better part only of "them." This gives occasion to some carping; and in other passages there is something like a sneer at Milton's "doctrine of the liberty of a People to choose their form of Government," implying as that would, says the author, their liberty to choose their Religion also. But, on the whole, the language is that of a man acknowledging the eminence of his opponent.[1]

The second tract, a small duodecimo in Latin, bears to have been published at Dublin,[2] and has the title "*Carolus I., Britanniarum Rex, a securi et calamo Miltonii vindicatus*," ("Charles I., King of the British Islands, Vindicated from the Axe and the Pen of Milton.") A motto from Plautus follows in the title-page. The printing of the book is dreadfully bad, as if done at some poor clandestine press, and whole pages are so blurred with the blacking that had been used for ink as to be hardly legible. It consists of two pages of dedication to Charles II. and 118 pages of text. The Dedication opens thus:—"Salmasius seems to me to have kept silence too much "under his attack from Milton, though he is generally sharp "and sedulous in avenging calumnies. Unequal to the task "though I am, I have taken his side, and instituted as it were

---

[1] About Filmer's earlier life little seems to be known. See Wood's Ath. by Bliss, III. 50, with notes there; also Chalmers's Biog. Dict. Art. *Filmer*. I have looked at copies of his earlier writings in the British Museum. In the Preface to one of them, entitled *Observations upon Aristotle's Politiques*, dated 1652, the author, still withholding his name, advertises his tract on Hobbes, Milton, and Grotius, as a "lately published" work of his. Filmer's writings were in great demand after the Restoration. His *Patriarcha*, which ranks as the chief of them, and which Locke set himself to refute in his two Treatises on Government, may have been in manuscript at our present date (1652), but did not see the light till 1680, when the author seems to have been in extreme old age. In Chalmers's Biog. Dict. he is blunderingly said to have died in 1647.

[2] "Dublini, Apud Liberum Correctorem, via 'Regia,' sub signo Solutæ Fascis, 1652." I have not ascertained the exact date in 1652, but think it was early in the year. It hardly matters.

"a preliminary skirmish, till he shall collect his forces, array "the field, and bring on the real battle." In the book itself he begins by saying that he had marvelled that such a deed of atrocity as the execution of Charles should have found a man brazen enough to defend it, till he had learnt that Milton was one of the Parliamentarians, nay of the Independents and Separatists, and therefore he was but pleading the cause of his party. In replying to Milton, he adds, he will not follow Milton's example, and descend to insults and personalities. "That is the custom," he says, "of schoolmasters and women, not of learned men, like Salmasius and Milton." On the whole, he keeps his word, and goes on, in a dull, feeble, but not unlearned way, with marginal references and quotations from the classics, to comment on the arguments and phrases of Milton's *Defensio* in their order. The most noticeable approach to smartness is perhaps where he replies to Milton's imputation on the morals of the late King founded on stories of his too obvious attentions occasionally to young Court-ladies. "Truly," he says, "you are a stiff and severe censor, "Milton, and one of the frigids and sour-bloods, I should "think (*et, ut puto, unus e frigidis et maleficiatis*), who would "keep off the hand of a handsome man, young too, and a "King to boot, whose right is touching, from the touch of "beautiful girls"; and he proceeds to assure Milton that girls themselves like such little attentions, that they are quite innocent, and that, though he may not know the fact, they were usual enough in England before the Reformation. Naturally, however, such little love-preludes might not please a man who had put away a nice wife of his own from jealousy, and had added *Divorce at the Husband's Pleasure* to the previous doctrines of the Independents.——Who the author of this tract was nobody knows. He seems to have lived somewhere out of the world, whether in Dublin or not; and I doubt whether six copies of his tract came to London.[1]

More troublesome to Milton than either of these two small additions to the Salmasian controversy can have been, if they troubled him at all, was the continuation of the inquiry about the printing by Dugard of the Racovian Catechism. This inquiry, begun so sharply in the Council of State on the 27th of January, had passed into open Parliament. It may be remembered that the famous *Committee of Parliament for the Propagation of the Gospel* originated in the appearance of Mr. Owen and other ministers at the bar of the House on the 10th of February, 1651–2, presenting a Petition and leaving a certain "Printed Book" (ante p. 390). That book was, in fact, the Racovian Catechism, or *Catechesis Ecclesiarum Poloniæ*, printed by Dugard; and, while the House had taken the opportunity of appointing one Committee to confer with those Petitioning Ministers and others on the wide subject of the Propagation of the Gospel, they had appointed, as we saw, a much larger Committee to consider and report on the special subject of the Petition. Well, the Report of this large Committee was made to the House on the 2nd of April by Mr. Millington, and with terrific effect. First there was an appalling collection, in the names of Owen, Nye, Sidrach Simpson, John Durie, William Bridge, Adoniram Byfield, William Greenhill, and others, of "the principal blasphemous errors" in the Racovian Catechism, in the form of extracts of passages from it, denying the Trinity, denying the Divinity of Christ, the Divinity of the Holy Ghost, the Doctrine of the Atonement, the Doctrine of Original Sin, &c., and averring such doctrines, though believed by the generality of Churches, to be gross and pernicious fallacies. Then, as the Journals go on, Mr. Millington reported "That Mr. William "Dugard is the printer of the Book, and the Examination of "the said Mr. William Dugard, and also Considerations "humbly presented to the Committee of Parliament by "Mr. William Dugard, and the humble Petition of William "Dugard; and the Examination of Mr. Francis Gouldman; "and the Examination of Mr. Henry Whalley; *and the* "*Examination of Mr. John Milton, and a Note under the hand* "*of Mr. John Milton of the* 10*th of August*, 1650." The end of it was that the House passed Resolutions condemning the

---

[1] Lowndes's *Bibliog. Man.* by Bohn (Art. *Milton*) calls it "the scarcest volume" in the Salmasian controversy. I believe my account of it is quite sufficient.

Book as "blasphemous, erroneous, and scandalous," and ordering all copies of it to be publicly burned in London and Westminster, under direction of the Sheriffs. The burning of the Racovian Catechism must have been the great event of that week in London, and there must have been much talk over Dugard's attempt to diffuse Socinianism openly in England. Apparently his explanations on the subject to the House had been accepted in excuse; for, though the Committee had reported him and Gouldman as undoubtedly guilty, no punishment seems to have ensued. What may have been the nature of Milton's concern in the affair we do not know. Was the note under his hand, of August 10, 1650, anything to which Dugard could refer as a permission or recommendation to print the book, received from the Council of State's own Latin Secretary at the very beginning of Dugard's printing-connexion with the Council? This is mere guess; and one can only note that the Examination of Milton on the subject was in February, 1651–2, not long before his total blindness, and that therefore he must always have remembered the affair of the Racovian Catechism as coincident with those last sad walks of his through St. James's Park, when he still thought he could see the trees.[1]

Associated in his memory with the same time must have been the birth of his fourth child, another daughter. She was born on Sunday the 2nd of May, 1652, and was named Deborah. Anne, her eldest sister, was then not quite six years old; Mary, the next, was under four; the little boy John, intermediate between Mary and Deborah, seems to have been still alive, fourteen months old. The father can hardly have ever *seen* the infant Deborah; but he entered her birth, or caused it to be entered, in his wife's Bible thus: "My daughter Deborah was born the 2nd of May, being Sunday, somewhat before three of the clock in the morning."[1]

---

[1] Commons Journals of dates given. The proceedings in the Racovian Catechism business must have occupied the House nearly the whole day at their meeting of April 2, and fill two folio columns in the Journals. The affair reappeared on June 22, when it was referred to the Committee for Plundered Ministers to find out "the authors, printers, and publishers of the *Racovian Catechism in English*." I infer that Dugard's edition had been in Latin, and that the notoriety it had obtained had led to the more daring act of a publication of the same in English. There are extant copies of an English Translation of the Catechism, dated 1652; but it purports to have been printed at Amsterdam. In 1818 there was an edition of "The Racovian Catechism, with Notes and Illustrations, translated from the Latin," by Thomas Rees, F.S.A.

Two Sonnets of Milton's, the first pieces of English verse he had written since his Secretaryship began, are additional marks in his life at our present point, and may be read here as the expressions of his strongest departing interest, for the moment, in the men and things of the visible world:—

TO THE LORD GENERAL CROMWELL.

Cromwell, our chief of men, who through a cloud
    Not of war only, but detractions rude,
    Guided by faith and matchless fortitude,
    To peace and truth thy glorious way hast ploughed,
And on the neck of crowned Fortune proud
    Hast reared God's trophies, and His work pursued,
    While Darwen Stream, with blood of Scots imbrued,
    And Dunbar field, resounds thy praises loud,
And Worcester's laureate wreath: yet much remains
    To conquer still; Peace hath her victories
    No less renowned than War: new foes arise
Threatening to bind our souls with secular chains.
    Help us to save free conscience from the paw
    Of hireling wolves, whose Gospel is their maw.

TO SIR HENRY VANE THE YOUNGER.

Vane, young in years, but in sage counsel old,
    Than whom a better senator ne'er held
    The helm of Rome, when gowns, not arms, repelled
    The fierce Epirot and the African bold,—
Whether to settle Peace, or to unfold
    The drift of hollow states hard to be spelled;
    Then to advise how War may best, upheld,
    Move by her two main nerves, iron and gold,
In all her equipage: besides to know
    Both Spiritual power and Civil, what each means,

---

[1] For an account of this Bible, see ante, p. 335, note.

What severs each, thou hast learned; which few have done.
The bounds of either sword to thee we owe:
Therefore on thy firm hand Religion leans
In peace, and reckons thee her eldest son.

These Sonnets have been read often, and even read often together; but the exact meaning of each, and the full meaning of the two conjointly, can be apprehended only by referring them to their date and circumstances.—The Sonnet to Cromwell is generally read as Milton's testimony of his admiration for Cromwell all in all; and, from the splendid boundlessness of the main epithet, amid all the historical precision of the rest, the Sonnet may well stand as such to all time. But the title of the Sonnet in the original draft, as it was dictated by Milton to an amanuensis, is "TO THE LORD GENERAL CROMWELL, MAY 1652, ON THE PROPOSALS OF CERTAIN MINISTERS AT THE COMMITTEE FOR PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL." This fixes the purport, and turns the Sonnet into an adjuration from Milton to Cromwell at one juncture of English affairs. We know what the "Committee for the Propagation of the Gospel" was; we know who the "certain Ministers" were; we know what were their "Proposals"; we know that, on the 29th of April, in connexion with these proposals, it was referred by the Parliament to the Committee to consider speedily "how a competent and convenient maintenance for a godly and able ministry may be settled in lieu of Tithes"; and we know what an excitement there was in the community on the whole subject, and what expectations there were in particular from the wisdom and religious liberality of Cromwell, who was one of the members of the Committee (ante pp. 387–395). And now we see that Milton was, and had all along been, one of these expectants. The salvation of England from a Hireling Church in any form, the battering down of all proposals, from whomsoever, and with whatsoever pretexts, that might tend to the continuation of such a Church, was a work of peace, Milton also thought, worthy of Cromwell himself, the most heroic and massive man of the whole land, in his well-won leisure after Preston, Dunbar, and Worcester. So strongly does

Milton feel this that, even in the forced retirement of his first blindness, when he is on temporary leave of absence from the Council meetings, the subject occupies his thoughts, and he cannot refrain from addressing Cromwell in a metrical missive. —I have no doubt that the Sonnet was sent by Milton to Cromwell, and that it was seen at the time by others. The Sonnet to Vane, dictated to a different amanuensis, must have been all but contemporary, for it was in Vane's hands, we certainly know, on the 3rd of July.[1] Milton could not go quite so high in his estimate of Vane, addressed even to Vane himself, as in his estimate of Cromwell; but he says his best. He divides his praise of the younger and more civilian statesman into two parts. Better than almost any other politician, Vane had mastered and could propound the true theory of the distinction between the Civil Power and the Spiritual in Commonwealths. His perception of that distinction in the abstract was perhaps even clearer than Cromwell's, so that he might be better on his guard, in certain cases, against a specious mixing of Civil Magistracy with Religion under the guise of a State-church! Then what depth in diplomacy, what subtlety of insight into the concealed tendencies of foreign states, what energy in preparing ways and means for war! This would apply to Vane's whole political career since he had been in the Council of State, for his interest in the foreign affairs of the Commonwealth, and his leadership in the Committee of the Council for these affairs, had always been conspicuous; but one is not to forget that the most critical and intricate business in the Council of State for several months before the Sonnet was written was precisely that negotiation with the Dutch Ambassadors, Catz, Schaep, and Van de Perre in which Vane would be in his element. Nay, the first cannonading between Blake and Van Tromp in the Channel (May 19), and the arrival of a fourth ambassador, Pauw, to avert the consequences of that mishap (June 11), were incidents, as it happened, of Vane's month of Presidency of the Council (May 17—June 14), when he may be said to have formally represented England. A war with the Dutch had then declared itself to be inevitable; and, when the Sonnet was in Vane's hands, the war had broken out.

---

[1] "The Life and Death of Sir Henry Vane, Kt." published in 1662 anonymously, but written by George Sikes. It is rather an account of Vane's opinions than a Life; but at p. 93 it is said, "The character of this deceased statesman . . . I shall exhibit to you in a paper of verses composed by a learned gentleman, and sent him July 3, 1652." Then follows Milton's Sonnet, quoted in full.

Coincident in time with the Sonnets to Cromwell and Vane, and giving us another interesting glimpse of Milton in his enforced period of absence from office-duty in the beginning of his blindness, is one of his Latin Familiar Epistles. It is addressed to a Greek, named Leonard Philaras, respecting whom these are a few particulars:—Born at Athens about the end of the sixteenth century, he had been educated mainly in Italy, had spent some years in military service, but had passed into a diplomatic career. After having been employed in agencies at the Papal Court for Charles, Duke of Nevers, claimant of the Dukedom of Mantua, and subsequently holder of that Dukedom, he had, since about 1640, been residing in Paris, as ambassador or agent at the French Court, first for Odoardo Farnese, Duke of Parma, and then for his successor, Ranuccio II. He had been greatly in favour with Richelieu, and was by this time, under the name of Villeré (by corruption of Philaras), a very well known man in Paris, with a reputation for scholarship as well as for political ability. His reputation for scholarship seems to have rested partly on his general interest in books and literary matters, partly on a few Greek Odes and Epigrams which he had composed, and which, as being by a native Athenian, were regarded as curiosities. One of them, published in 1644, was ’Ωιδη εἰς την ἀναμαρτητον συλληψιν τῆς Θεοτοκου ("Ode to the Immaculate Conception of the Mother of God"); another was ’Εγκωμιαστικον εἰς τον ἐξοχωτατον Καρδιναλιν Δοῦκα τον ’Ριχελιον ("Encomiastic to the most distinguished Cardinal Duke Richelieu."). A portrait of Philaras had been published at Paris, with the inscription Λεοναρδος Φιλαρᾶς, υἱος ’Ιωαννου, Αθηναιος ("Leonard Philaras, son of John, Athenian"); and this portrait had been accompanied by a Latin eulogium, giving a sketch of his life, and also by what was called a "logograph" of his name, i. e. a resolution of it, syllable by syllable, into significant Greek words.[1]

It will be observed that Philaras had sent a copy of this portrait and also a copy of the eulogium to Milton; and it is probable that Milton had derived his knowledge of the antecedents of Philaras from the eulogium. The portrait, of course, he could hardly now see; but in his reply to Philaras he is quite reticent on the subject of his blindness. The Latin runs thus:—

To the most distinguished Leonard Philaras, of Athens, Ambassador from the Duke of Parma to the King of France.

Your good will towards me, most honoured LEONARD PHILARAS, as well as your high opinion of our *Defence for the English People,* I learnt from your letters, written partly on that subject, to MR. AUGIER, a man illustrious among us for his remarkable fidelity in diplomatic business for this Republic [ante p. 381]: after which I received, through the same, your kind greeting, with your portrait, and the accompanying eulogium, certainly most worthy of your virtues,—and then, finally, a most polite letter from yourself. Be assured that I, who am not in the habit of despising the genius of the Germans, or even of the Danes or Swedes, cannot but value very much such an opinion of me from *you,* a native of Attic Athens, who have besides, after happily finishing a course of literary studies among the Italians, reached such ample honours by great handling of affairs. For, as the great Alexander himself, when carrying on war in the remotest parts of the earth, declared that he had undergone such great labours *for the sake of the good opinion of the Athenians* [the phrase quoted in Greek, τῆς παρ' Ἀθηναίων εὐδοξίας ἕνεκα], why should not I congratulate myself, and think myself honoured to the highest, in having received praises from one in whom singly at this day the Arts of the old Athenians and all their celebrated excellencies appear, after so long an interval, to revive and rebloom? Remembering how many men of supreme eloquence were produced by that city, I have pleasure in confessing that whatever literary advance I have made I owe chiefly to steady intimacy with their writings from my youth upwards. But, were there in me, by direct gift from them, or a kind of transfusion, such a power of pleading that I could rouse our armies and fleets for the deliverance of Greece, the land of eloquence, from her Ottoman oppressor—to which mighty act you seem almost to implore our aid—truly there is nothing which it would be more or sooner in my desire to do. For what did even the bravest men of old, or the most eloquent, consider more glorious or more worthy of them than, whether by pleading or by bravely acting, *to make the Greeks free and self-governing* [again a Greek phrase, *ἐλευθέρους καὶ αὐτονόμους ποιείσθαι τοὺς Ἕλληνας*]? There is, however, something else besides to be tried, and in my judgment far the most important: namely that some one should, if possible, arouse and rekindle in the minds of the Greeks, by the relation of that old story, the old Greek valour itself, the old industry, the old patience of labour. Could some one do *that*—and from no one more than yourself ought we to expect it, looking to the strength of your feeling for your native land, and the combination of the same with the highest prudence, skill in military affairs, and a powerful passion for the recovery of the ancient political liberty—then, I am confident, neither would the Greeks be wanting to themselves, nor any other nation wanting to the Greeks. Farewell.

---

[1] These particulars I have derived from a "Notice sur Leonard Philaras" in *Mélanges de Critique et de Philologie, par S. Chardon de la Rochette, Paris,* 1812 (Vol. II. pp. 302—332). For the reference I am indebted to Professor Gennadios of the University of Athens.

London, June 1652.

The dating of this letter from "London," instead of from "Westminster," may not be without significance. It is possible that for some weeks about this time, for reasons connected with his blindness, or for family reasons, Milton was away from his house in Petty France and in quarters somewhere in the City. This would explain several particulars at present in doubt. Thus, although Phillips distinctly states that Milton's youngest daughter, Deborah, born May 2, 1652, was "born at his house in Petty France," there is no entry of her birth where, in that case, we should have expected to find it: viz. in the Registers of St. Margaret's Parish, Westminster, within the bounds of which the Petty France house was situated.[1] May not Phillips's memory have been at fault, therefore, in this small matter, and may not the birth have taken place in some other house, to which there had been a temporary removal?

---

[1] The entry of the birth ought to have been found close to that of Marchamont Needham's son Marchamont, on May 6, 1652 (see ante p. 433, note.) But it is not there.

Viscount Lisle, Commissioner Lisle, Chief Justice Rolle, and then Vane, had been the successive Presidents of the Council during those months in which Milton, as we calculate, had been shut up in his first blindness in his house in Petty France. Our last extracts from the Council Order Books belonged to Commissioner Lisle's Presidency. Premising that Thurloe had established himself thoroughly in his general Secretaryship to the Council during the subsequent Presidencies of Chief Justice Rolle and Vane, and that Milton had not ceased through these Presidencies to take some part at least in the preparation of the documents required in his department,[1] let us resume our notes in July, when the rupture with the Dutch was complete:—

Sunday, July 11, 1652 (Earl of Pembroke now President):—There were two Sunday meetings this day in the great stress of affairs. At the first were present—the Earl of Pembroke in the Chair, and Whitlocke, Constable, Bradshaw, Burrell, Purefoy, Holland, Pickering, Salway, and Stapley; and, besides the war-business, with letters to Blake, &c., there was this order:—"That "it be returned in answer to Dr. Brian Walton that, upon the "reading and consideration of his petition, wherein he offers an "Edition of the Bible in several tongues, the Council are of "opinion that the work propounded by him is very honourable and "deserving encouragement, but find that the matter of his desires

---

[1] In proof take this curious anecdote from Edward Phillips's memoir of his uncle:—"Before the war broke forth "between the States of England and the "Dutch, the Hollanders sent over three "ambassadors in order to an accom-"modation; but, they returning *re in-"fecta* [not quite correct], the Dutch "sent away a plenipotentiary [Pauw] "to offer peace upon much milder "terms, or at least to gain more time. "But this plenipotentiary could not "make such haste but that the Parlia-"ment had procured a copy of their "Instructions in Holland, which were "delivered by our author [Milton] to his "kinsman that was then with him [John "Phillips] to translate for the Council "to view, before the said plenipotentiary "had taken shipping for England, and "an answer to all he had in charge lay "ready for him before he made his "public entry into London." As Pauw arrived June 11, this important bit of Council-work required of Milton, and done for him in his straits by Phillips, must be dated a few days before, and therefore within Vane's month of Presidency. The anecdote—followed by another, to the effect that, some time in the same year, John Phillips was sent to a certain foreigner who had arrived with a splendid train, pretending to be an agent for the Prince of Condé, but really a spy for Charles II., ordering him in the name of the Council to quit England immediately—suggests that John Phillips may have held a temporary appointment of a formal kind under his uncle.

"therein contained is more proper for the consideration of the "Parliament than the Council." Dr. Brian Walton was now fifty-two years of age, and living in his father-in-law's house in London, his prebend of St. Paul's, his chaplaincy to the King, and his other preferments in the old Church of England, all things of the past; he had even ceased, in his constancy to his Royalist and Episcopal principles, to exercise any ministerial function whatever; and he had turned his enforced leisure to the great scheme of the *Polyglott Bible.*[1] It had been heard of with wonder and respect; he had had much private encouragement from Usher, Selden, and other well-known men; but it was a work almost hopeless without public recognition and aid. Hence, it would seem, his application.

Tuesday, July 13 (Mr. Bond now President):—"That MR. "THURLOE do appoint fit persons to translate the Parliament's "Declaration into Latin, French, and Dutch." This is the Declaration of the Causes of War with the Dutch (see ante p. 374).

Tuesday, July 20:—Seventeen members present, but Cromwell not among them. (His attendances at the Council through this half-year are far from frequent.) *Memorandum by Thurloe:*—"Send MR. DUGARD to speak with MR. MILTON concerning the "printing of the Declaration: Send to MR. MILTON the order "made on Lord's Day was sevennight concerning DR. WALTON." This double memorandum reveals two things—first, that Milton had to superintend the Latin translation of the Declaration against the Dutch, and generally the printing of the same, whatever persons Thurloe may have found for the French and Dutch translations; and, secondly, that it must have been Milton that had been the means of bringing Brian Walton's petition about his *Polyglott* before the Council. Walton, therefore, must have been an acquaintance of Milton, and Milton must have been interested in his great project. The acquaintance may have dated from Milton's boyhood, or first College-days, when Walton, then quite a young man, was curate for some little time to the Rev. Richard Stock, Rector of Milton's native parish of Allhallows, Bread Street (ante, Vol. I. pp. 40–41, and Wood's Fasti II. 82).

Thursday, July 29:—A copy of the Declaration against the Dutch to be sent to each of the Foreign Ambassadors and Public Ministers in town, and also to each of the Public Ministers of the Commonwealth abroad; and Mr. Thurloe to see that copies are bound for the purpose.

Tuesday, August 10:—Colonel Purefoy now President, and seventeen other members present, including Cromwell. "That the "Paper now read in answer to the Paper of the Spanish Ambas-"sador be approved of, translated into Latin, and sent to the Lord "Ambassador of Spain by Sir Oliver Fleming."—This must pass as a specimen of various similar orders, month after month, for the translation into Latin of papers for the Spanish Ambassador, the Danish Ambassador, the Portuguese Ambassador, &c. As there is no mention of Milton's name in these, they need not be quoted; but we shall find other evidence that Milton did not leave all the duty to Weckherlin. The absurd Portuguese Ambassador, Don Roderigo Sa (ante p. 380), was an arrival of this month; and there is an order of September 17 for a magnificent entertainment to him—fifty dishes for the first and second courses, thirty dishes of fruits and sweetmeats for each "meal," nine "meals" in all, &c.

---

[1] Wood's Fasti, II. 81—82.

Thursday, October 7:—Sir William Constable in the Chair, and fifteen others present, Cromwell one of them. "That the "Paper this day given in to the Council by the Lord Ambas- "sador from the King of Portugal be translated by MR. MILTON "into English, and brought in to the Council to-morrow in "the afternoon." Is Milton now and then dropping in at the Council again? In July the memorandum still was to "*send to*" Mr. Milton.

Monday, November 8 (Sir William Masham in the Chair):—MR. THEODORE HAAK to receive £200 for "his labour and pains in translating a certain book out of the Dutch into English by appointment of the Council"; and 400 copies, and no more, of the book to be printed by Mr. Dugard at the public charge and delivered to Mr. Thurloe.

Monday, November 15:—"That it be referred to Mr. Thurloe to "consider of a fit reward to be given to MR. DURIE for his pains "in translating into French the book written by MR. MILTON in "answer to that of the late King, entitled his *Meditations.*" The order for this Translation had been given in May 1651 (see ante p. 315). The book, now ready, duly appeared as a neat small volume, of 451 pages, with the following title:—Εἰκονοκλάστης: *ou Réponse au Livre intitulé* "Εικων Βασιλικη, *ou Le Pourtrait de Sa Sacrée Majesté durant sa Solitude et ses Souffrances," par le S^{r} Jean Milton: Traduite de l'Anglois sur la seconde et plus ample édition, et revûe par l'Auteur. À laquelle sont ajoûtées diverses pièces mentionnées en ladite Réponse, pour la plus grande commodité du lecteur. À Londres. Par Guill. Dugard, Imprimeur du Conseil d'État, l'an* 1652; *et se vend par Nicolas Bourne, à la Porte Méridionale de la Vieille Bourse.* The statement that Milton had himself revised the Translation is interesting. Durie's name is not given in the book; but there is a prefixed *Avertissement au Lecteur* to the following effect: "The Reader is requested "to remark, before beginning the perusal of the present Treatise, "that the Translator has been obliged by several considerations, "but principally because of the elegance of the style and language "of the Author and of his conceptions, to keep strictly to his words "and expressions, as far as the French Language would permit, "for fear of losing the grace to be found in the original: which is "the reason why there may be found perhaps in this Version some "Anglicisms, or English idioms, or at least hardly French."

Tuesday, November 16:—Referred to the Lord General Cromwell, the Lord Commissioner Whitlocke, and the Lord Chief Justice St. John, "to consider of a fit encouragement to be given to "MR. PELL, for his remaining in England, and to read lectures "upon the Mathematics in some convenient place, and likewise to "consider of something to be done for him, in consideration of the "time he hath staid in England from places in foreign parts to "which he hath been invited, out of the good affections he bears "to his native country."—This JOHN PELL, a graduate of Trinity College, Cambridge, and now about forty-two years of age, had recently returned from abroad, where he had been living for about ten years, and had acquired some celebrity as a Professor of Mathematics in Amsterdam, and then at Breda (Wood's Fasti, I. 461–2). The Dutch wanted to have him back, it appears; but he preferred England, if he could have a suitable place there. He had petitioned the Council to that effect (Order Books, October 29), and this was the result. The Council desired to advance useful learning in the Commonwealth; and, besides, Pell had been so long among the Dutch that his services, apart from Mathematics, might be of value. Pell, we are to conceive, at this time, joined that group of ingenious and speculative men, hanging on about the Council, of which Hartlib, Durie, Haak, Needham, and others already known to us, were members, and which may be called the Hartlib, or even Hartlib-Milton, connexion. There are various entries in the Order Books about this time, which it is not necessary to quote, of money-gifts to Hartlib, Durie, Haak, and the rest of them, on account of services.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 1, 1652 (*Beginning of the Council of State for the Fifth Year of the Commonwealth*). Lord Commissioner Whitlocke was voted into the Chair; and there were present, besides, Mr. Lister, Mr. Love, Sir William Masham, Sir Henry Mildmay, Colonel Walton, Lord Commissioner Lisle, Mr. Strickland, Mr. Scott, Bradshaw, Colonel Ingoldsby, Sir James Harrington, Colonel Algernon Sidney, Mr. Bond, Sir Arthur Hasilrig, Alderman Allen, Colonel Purefoy, Sir John Bourchier, Mr. Gurdon, Mr. Cawley, Sir Gilbert Pickering, Mr. Challoner, Sir John Trevor, Colonel Morley, Colonel Thompson, Mr. Say, Colonel Fielder, Mr. Goodwin, and Sir William Brereton. All these were sworn in, leaving the absentees (among whom was Cromwell) to be sworn in when they appeared. The chief business of the meeting consisted in renewing the appointments of officers of the Council, and the like, and included these items:—"That MR. "THURLOE have after the allowance of £800 for the year to come "[worth about £2800 now] for and in consideration of his at"tending as Clerk to the Council and *the Committee for Foreign "Affairs*"—(The words in Italics are a substitution for the words "*of executing what hath formerly been done by Mr. Weckherlin,*" originally written, and still decipherable in the Order Book, though rather carefully blotted over).—"That MR. FROST be continued in "the employment he had the last year [that of Assistant to "Mr. Thurloe], and have the same allowance for it as he had the "last year.—That MR. MILTON be continued in the employment he "had the last year and have the same allowance for it as he had "the last year."—These are very important entries, and will receive subsequent comment.

Monday, December 20:—"That all Ambassadors who shall "come to have audience with the Council, or with any Committee "of the Council appointed to that purpose, be brought to the "stairfoot in the first Court in Whitehall in the coach in which he "[*sic*] is placed, his own coach of state and no other being also "permitted to come into the Court after him; and that he be from "thence brought to the Chamber appointed for meeting with "Ambassadors."

Thursday, January 27, 1652–3:—"That Mr. Frost do examine "what is due to MR. WECKHERLIN for his service to the Council "the last year, and that what doth thereupon appear to be due to "him be paid out of the Council's contingencies."

Tuesday, February 1, 1652–3:—"That MR. W. PRYNNE be "discharged from his imprisonment, he giving his own bond to the "sum of £1000 that he will not for the future act anything to the "prejudice of this Commonwealth and the present Government "thereof." Prynne, as one of the most desperate opponents of the Commonwealth, had been a prisoner since its establishment, first in London, then at Dunster Castle in Somerset, then at Taunton, and then in Pendennis Castle in Cornwall. For a while he had continued to send forth pamphlet after pamphlet, about one every month, in his old fashion; but that had been stopped, and now he had yielded.

Friday, February 10, 1652–3:—"That the sum of £200 be "paid out of the exigent moneys of the Council to MR. MARCHAMONT NEEDHAM, in consideration of his great labour and pains in "the translating of Mr. Selden's book entitled *Mare Clausum.*" Originally published in 1635, in answer to the *Mare Liberum* of Hugo Grotius, this famous book of Selden's had always been regarded as the most masterly defence of English dominion at sea, especially against Dutch claims; and an edition of it in English was very desirable when Blake was fighting the Dutch Admirals. Needham's Translation of the Treatise was thought good, and is now a scarce book.

Sunday, March 27, 1653:—Present Mr. Bond (President for the month), the Lord General Cromwell, Vane, Pickering, Thompson, Gurdon, Trevor, Sir W. Masham, Fielder, and Alderman Allen. Blake's tremendous three days' victory over Van Tromp in the Channel (ante p. 376) was now a month old; Dutch sailors were prisoners in England; and there were again proposals of peace from the Dutch. There was this extraordinary Sunday meeting in the emergency. Letters were sent off to Blake and the other Generals of the Fleet.

Friday, April 1, 1653 (nineteen days before Cromwell's *coup d'état*):—"That the Commissioners of Customs do permit certain "books by Mr. Milton, written in answer to the Book called the "late King's, being translated into French, to be transported into "France custom free." This is a bale of copies of Durie's French translation of the *Eikonoklastes*, destined for circulation on the Continent.

If the reader will connect these extracts duly with what has gone before, he will understand still more precisely the extent to which Milton's fitness for his Secretaryship had been affected by his blindness. From March to about November 1652 he had Weckherlin for his assistant. Even then, as was natural, some attention to the foreign department of the Council's business in Mr. Milton's absence had been quietly required of the new General Secretary, Mr. Thurloe. But about November, just when the Council of State for the Fourth year was expiring and the new Council of State for the Fifth year was coming into power, something more was found necessary. Weckherlin had failed in health or had been found ineffective, and was no longer in habitual attendance. The new Council, therefore, on the first day of its meeting (Dec. 1, 1652), had made the arrangement minuted in their Order Books under that date. Milton was still to be *Secretary for Foreign Tongues* to the Council as before; but Mr. Thurloe was thenceforth to relieve him of the details that would be most difficult for him, and was to receive, on that account, the £200 a year formerly assigned to Weckherlin, and so to have a salary altogether of £800 instead of £600. The arrangement was evidently one of some delicacy. At first the minute purported that Thurloe should have the extra £200 a year for "*executing what hath formerly been done by Mr. Weckherlin*"; but this wording was altered, and it was minuted that Thurloe's increased total salary should be for his "*attending as Clerk to the Council and the Committee for Foreign Affairs.*" This exactly covered what was wanted.

Personal attendance was Milton's main difficulty now; and the personal attendance belonging properly to his post was of three varieties—(1) attendance at all meetings of the Committee of the Council for Foreign Affairs, (2) attendance at meetings of the Council itself whenever Foreign Affairs were discussed, (3) attendance at Conferences of the Council itself or of its Committee with foreign ambassadors and envoys. As Thurloe, in his capacity of General Secretary, had to be always present, at any rate, at meetings of the whole Council, it was only necessary to stipulate for his presence also at meetings of the Foreign Affairs Committee; and then at least Nos. 1 and 2 of the fore-mentioned were amply provided for. It was not meant that Milton should not himself attend still when he was able and thought fit, but only that Thurloe might now be, to any needed extent, the medium of communication between the Council and Milton. And so, with old Weckherlin superseded, and indeed, as we shall find, dying, the work of the Council seems to have gone on smoothly enough.

When the war with the Dutch had at last been declared (July 1652), the Dutch correspondence in *Mercurius Politicus* began, of course, to give details illustrating the violence of the Anti-English feeling that had been provoked across the water. "It is not to be expressed," writes a correspondent from the Hague in the paper for July 15–22, "how some here "foam at the mouth with railings against you; and they "permit the press to be more licentious than themselves, as "may appear by the daily production of pamphlets which are "so ridiculous and simple that they are not worth naming." One pamphleteer, however, likely to be forthcoming soon, and that "by special authority," *is* named. "Salmasius, that dirty "and most dissolute parasite of Kings, is to be set to work," says the writer, adding, "Is it not fine that Holland, a Com"monweal, should employ Salmasius, the pander of tyranny?"

Now that the two nations were at war, there was no reason why the Government of the United Provinces should continue their prohibition of Salmasius's *Defensio Regia*, or restrain him from any sequel to it. Yet, whatever Salmasius was meditating, nothing of the kind expected did come from him, and all was uncertainty yet even about the existence on paper of any portion of his Reply to Milton, said long ago to have been ready for press. But, suddenly, while all eyes were directed to Salmasius himself at Leyden, there appeared at the Hague a new ally of his in the Miltonic controversy, of far bigger and more mysterious figure than any yet seen. "*Regii Sanguinis Clamor ad Cœlum adversus Parricidas Anglicanos: Hagæ Comitum, ex Typographia Adriani Ulac*, 1652" ("Cry of the King's Blood to Heaven against the English Parricides. Hague, from the press of Adrian Ulac, 1652): such was the title of an extraordinary anonymous book, a small quarto of about 160 pages of rather open type, of which people abroad and in England were soon talking. The exact day of its publication at the Hague has eluded my search;[1] but it was probably in August 1652. Let us look at the book itself.

REGII SANGUINIS CLAMOR AD COELUM.

The volume opens with a dedication "To Charles II., by the grace of God King of Great Britain, France, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, &c.," purporting to be by the printer, and signed "Your Majesty's most devoted, A. Ulac." In this dedication there is enormous praise of Salmasius and his *Defensio Regia.* He is styled "the wonderful Salmasius, who "has neither peer nor second in the universal world of letters "and sciences, and who has already brought to the service of "your Majesty's cause his stupendous and infinite erudition, "joined to his heavenly genius," in a work "eternal and higher "than the regal structure of the Pyramids." In that work it could not be sufficiently admired "how a man of French

---

[1] In the Thomason copy in the British Museum, and also in Thomason's Catalogue of his Collection, the date is distinctly given as "March 22, 1651—2"; but here Thomason must be in error for once. That date is proved to be too early by many considerations, and indeed by the express statement of the publisher Ulac himself afterwards (Preface to Hague edition of Milton's *Defensio Secunda,* 1654) that, though the manuscript had been in his hands for some months before the outbreak of the war between England and the Dutch, he had waited till the war had actually begun, before venturing to put it to press. That negatives all possibility that the book can have been out before July or August 1652. Did Thomason's copy come to him late, and does his marking "March 22" mean really "March 22, 1652—3"?

"birth, who never foresaw that such a province of things "would call for his attention, had shed light suddenly on "English affairs to their inmost recesses." But more was to come from him yet. "He himself presently, in another "print against the Rebels on which he is engaged, will at "once choke the throats of their chiefs and show us MILTON "castigated to his deserts,—'*that monster, hideous, ugly, huge,* "'*bereft of sight.*'[1] No, not 'huge,' for nothing more puny, "pale, and shrivelled than he in the whole race of those "insects that, the sharper they sting, hurt the less. It will "be a pleasure to behold the hero grasping in his hands that "discredit to the human race and holding such an Antæus "far from the shore." Touching on the subject of the war going on between the English and the States-General, Ulac, as the professing writer of the Dedication, adds that he can desire nothing better for the States-General than that they may make an end of the war as happily as Salmasius will make an end of Milton.

A Preface by the author himself follows, addressed "To the Christian Reader," and containing a few enigmatic sentences about the author and his qualifications. "I am so familiar "with the society of the English of best note," he says, "that "I dare affirm I know thoroughly, from the skin inwards, "those monsters of men whom the Hell-King led forth to this "horrible parricide, and, in particular, that I have a fuller and "better view of the face of England than can be expected of "one unskilled in the English tongue and who has not seen "the shores of Britain. The suppression of my name has "been easily obtained from me by the English with whom "I associate; nor am I ambitious of the little glory there "might be from a small work of this sort, or much in want of "glory at all." After more to the same effect in the Preface, the author passes on to the main book. It is divided into eight chapters, thus:—"Chap. I., Occasion and Purport of "this Writing"; "Chap. II., Crimes of the Parricides against "Royal Majesty"; "Chap. III., Crimes of the Parricides

---

[1] The Latin phrase used is Virgil's line about Polyphemus (*Æn.* III. 658): '*Monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum.*'"

"against the People;" "Chap. IV., Injuries done by the "Parricides to the Church;" "Chap. V., Injuries by the "Parricides to God;" "Chap. VI., Injuries by the Parricides "to all Kings and Peoples;" "Chap. VII., Injuries by the "Parricides to the Reformed Churches;" "Chap. VIII., That "all the Pious ought to pursue that Deed of Parricide with "the most eager determination and raise to Heaven the cry "of the King's Blood." These headings will suggest the general scope of the volume. It may be described as a narrative flooded with objurgation. The style of it, with the strong points, may be represented by a few specimens.

HORROR OF EUROPE AT THE EXECUTION OF CHARLES FIRST ADEQUATELY EXPRESSED BY SALMASIUS:—"In comparison with that deed the guilt of the Jews in their crucifying of Christ was nothing, whether you have in view the spirit of the men or the effects of the crime. . . . . This enormous iniquity pierced all the truly Reformed to the quick with the acutest anguish, especially the French and the Dutch. Everywhere tears, sobbings, gatherings in the streets, and the wildest indignation against the wicked Parricides. . . . Hence so many books breathing out the just anger of learned men . . .; and more would have come forth if all had had printers at hand . . . And so there appeared CLAUDIUS SALMASIUS, the great Prince of Letters . . . To him, while the world shall stand, Kings will owe the vindication of their dignity and safety; to him will the Church be indebted; to him Religion; nor will any age be silent on such a vast service performed by a surpassing man. The same field was trodden by another ornament of our age, the great Samuel Bochartus, in a short, but, Good God! what a learned little book, and put together with what logical closeness! Why should I mention Vicentius, Heraldus, Porræus, and other well-affectioned and learned men? . . . But the man who wholly unwound the entire web of the English villainy, and dragged those Cerberuses into the hated light, was THE GREAT SALMASIUS. . . . Never did a great man rise higher, never higher Salmasius himself. But I will spare my praises."

CONSTERNATION OF THE ENGLISH, AND HOW THEY PITCHED ON MILTON:—"The Parricides were alarmed at the fame of the great work of Salmasius—not at the reading of it; for what one here and there among these scoundrels understands Latin? They heard this truly Royal Defence extolled by the favourable reports of all; they heard that Salmasius himself was cherished in all hearts, that the patron of Princes was an object of care to Princes, that he was receiving invitations and the amplest offers from the most august Queen of Sweden, and that their Tyranny built on Parricide was everywhere held accursed. The beasts then, worshippers of Ignorance, looked about for some hunger-starved little man of Grammar who might be willing to lend his venal pen to the defence of Parricide. One *was* found, after they had expelled learning from their territories, who *could* undertake to write Latin—the great hero, forsooth, that they would oppose to Salmasius—JOHN MILTON. Who and whence he was no matter, whether a human being or a worm that had come yesterday from the dunghill. What could they do? Selden threw the odious task from his shoulders; there was a drought in the Universities, which had been carefully purged by themselves of all remnants of Learning."

ANTECEDENTS OF MILTON:—"They say that the man, having been expelled from the University of Cambridge for his profligacy, fled from the disgrace and from his native country, and migrated to Italy, and that he was recalled thence by the hope of a new world at the outbreak of the Rebellion, and was welcomed by the impious faction. . . . After his return he wrote a *Book on Divorce*, in which he contended that marriages, however solemnized, might be dissolved at the pleasure of either of the married persons; and he could do this with impunity, of course, in a Republic in which the masters could hardly claim the license of crimes for themselves unless they allowed it also to the men of their party. Nor even here was there rest for one made for the violation of all rights; for he passed from the dissolution of Marriages to the divorce of Kingdoms. When, accordingly, the death of the King was in agitation among the conspirators, and most were shrinking from so huge a crime, the fiendish gallows-bird (*Tartareus furcifer*) wrote for them, and shoved the waverers to the evil side, urging this in especial, that their own lives were concerned, for either they or the King must perish. No need, then, for farther inquiry *who* severed the sacred neck of the King with the accursed axe: here we have the hangman who advised the deed and did it. He himself says 'I did it;' he confesses the guilt, takes it to himself, hugs it, boasts of it. This he does in his blackguardly book which he entitled *Eikonoklastes*, in which the hideous hangman insults the holy memory of King Charles."

THE ENGLISH REPUBLIC AND ITS CHIEFS:—"By another edict Monarchy was abolished, the House of Lords abrogated, the highly ancient Kingdom of England turned into a Popular State. And, to make your indignation greater, all this by a small Council of forty plebeian scoundrels! . . . While they loosen the reins to the deadly licence of prodigious sects, while they themselves cannot tell what Religion they profess, or to what Confession of Faith they accede, yet all of them keep up a growl of sanctimony, nor do the holy scoundrels perpetrate any crime without the parade of most religious accompaniments. In this way Religion suffers the same from the tyrants that Christ suffered from the soldiers of Pilate, by whom he was at once beaten with buffets and adored on bended knee. The language of their public documents is stuffed with piety; the style of Cromwell and his tribunes is to match; it would move anyone's bile and bitter laughter to mark with what impudence the secret rogues and open robbers mask their wickedness with a pretext of Religion. . . . Verily an egg is not liker an egg than Cromwell is like Mahomet."

APPEAL TO THE FRENCH AND THE DUTCH:—"Much is for consideration, if ever generous Gaul can use her strength for exacting satisfaction from the Parricides and avenging the injury done to the Royal Blood of France. The French have with them a daughter of their great Henry, worthy of such a father, now thrust from her dowry, banished, proscribed, pronounced the guilty cause of the late war, widowed by the murder of her husband-King, the mother of orphans driven from their patrimony; for whom too war is ready and the axe prepared. The griefs of such a heroic woman, her royal blood, her valour too, equal to her birth, superior to her sex, move the King, the Princes, the nobles, and all France, to a just vengeance for so many injuries. . . . The feeling of the Dutch towards the Parricides has been better shown by the People than by the States-General, who have more practice in simulating and more need for dissimulation. The Dutch People, who call a boat a boat and a spade a spade, called the ambassadors of the English Commonwealth and their gang Robbers, Traitors, and Parricides."

At the end of the book are appended two sets of Latin verses. One is a "Eucharistic Ode," in eighteen Horatian stanzas of sustained eulogy, "To the great Salmasius for his Royal Defence." The other consists of no fewer than 245 lines of scurrilous Iambics addressed "To the Bestial Blackguard John Milton, the Advocate of Parricides and Parricide," ("*In Impurissimum Nebulonem, Johannem Miltonum, Parricidarum et Parricidii Advocatum.*") Of the latter, in its essential parts, the following is a version in the rough:—

"Whither, without my leave, scud ye so fast,
My brisk Iambics? Underneath your heels
To tread to pieces an ignoble cur,
Snapping his teeth at the great King-defender
And Kings themselves? Me to have doings with
This blotch, this ulcer? No, no; Ugh! ugh! ugh!
A wretch whom even the beadle would not touch
But at hook-length, or drag to punishment
But with held nose, shall I pollute myself,
An honest Ketch, with scourging publicly?
  But, though I hold my own hand in disgust,
You shall not, Sir, by sufferance of mine,

Escape some markings for your villainy.
Ho! Strappers, seize the blackguard as he stands;
Seize him, quick, quick; and bind him up all-fours:
I owe the Whipping Powers a solemn day.
First let your rising pupil of the gallows
Taste of the cat,—the People's champion he,
The Council's foreman: round his perjured head
Ply well the stick; lard every inch with weals,
Till you have thonged the carcase to one jelly.
Cease you already? Lay on, till he shed
Gall from his liver through his bleeding eyes.
  Striped now at last to a most perfect picture
Of the rod's varied painting, take the Sophist,
And bid him weep the rest before the feet
Of great Salmasius. He, I promise you,
Has worse in store, you rascal!

* * * * *

O, were you to be feared but half as much
As you are execrable, then you'd be
Hercules over again, and with your name
Mothers would fright their children; little ones
Would tremble to be eaten as they saw you!
Well that it's not so—that, although a pest
More sly than Sinon, fiercer than Busiris,
More savage than a tigress for her whelps,
You're yet less warlike than a running rabbit,
Meaner to those that curse you than an ape,
Less than a louse!

* * * * *

King Charles is near—(ha! trembling now, you rogue!)—
A Virgin with the King, bearing the sword
And scales of Justice, death to tyranny!

* * * * *

Meanwhile do all you can; be what you are,
Subtler in shifting than a turning wheel,
Cooler than any thief cutting a purse,
Shriller than any conjuror of snakes,
Falser than any fortune-telling scamp,
More vile than Cromwell, damned than Ravaillac."

Here certainly was an antagonist for Milton such as he had never met with yet. Bishop Hall at his best had been nothing in comparison with this anonymous railer; nor, with all his affectation of being merely a poor precursor for Salmasius, could anything from the pen of Salmasius have had one tithe of the real pungency to be found in the *Regii*

Sanguinis Clamor. Besides the vitriolic ability, there is to be discerned in the writer, I think, a certain personal earnestness, intense to phrenzy, for the cause he is pleading. Who was he?

A Leyden correspondent of the London *Mercurius Politicus* writes thus in the number of that paper for Sept. 23–30, 1652:—"There is a mountebank lately come into our country out of "England, who goes up and down, selling his pack of small wares "at the Hague and other places, endeavouring to persuade some "of our States and others that this War is sorely against the "edge of a great many powerful grandees in England, who "would be glad of an expedient for the renewal of the Treaty; "but this is no more looked on here than the old wife's prate, "and of no more credit than the Articles of Faith which are "set down in that foul pasquil whose title is *The English* "*Devil*, nor of more moment than that of MONSIEUR MORUS, "entitled *Clamor Regii Sanguinis ad Cœlum*, which hath been "much cried up and down, till the author decried himself "and his reputation by . . . . . ." The rest may be reserved till we have given some preliminary account of this MONSIEUR MORUS.

MORE or MOIR is an old Scottish name. A Presbyterian Scot of this name, who had gone abroad in the time of James I., had settled in the town of Castres in Languedoc, as principal of a French Protestant College and pastor of a Protestant Church, and had been Latinized into MORUS. Of two sons of his, by a French wife, one was called Aaron and one Alexander, and both became Protestant preachers like their father. It is with ALEXANDER MORUS that we have to do. He was born at Castres in 1616, and, though half a Scot by birth, was practically a Frenchman. A wonderfully clever boy, and trained carefully at Castres by his father, he had been sent to Geneva to complete his theological studies. While he was there, the Professorship of Greek, which had been previously held by Casaubon, Scaliger, and Beza, fell vacant, and was thrown open to public competition; and Morus, though he was but twenty years of age, and there were many much older competitors, won the post with unanimous plaudits. In this, and in a subsequent theological professorship in which he succeeded Frederic Spanheim, on the removal of that theologian to Leyden, he continued at Geneva till 1649—known for the last eight years of his stay, however, not only as a theological lecturer, but also as one of the ministers of the city and a most popular preacher. Still there had been suspicions about his orthodoxy and rumours about his morals; and, as his temper was haughty and irritable, he had made enemies among his colleagues, and the gossips of Geneva had split themselves into the two parties of the Morists and the anti-Morists. Things were in this uncomfortable state when the great Salmasius, whose good graces Morus had somehow won, negotiated for bringing him into the Low Countries. Some said this was to spite Frederic Spanheim, who, while one of Morus's colleagues at Geneva, had been at feud with him there, but was now in Leyden and at feud with Salmasius. There was some difficulty in finding a place for Morus in the Low Countries; but Salmasius at length contrived that he should be called to Middleburg. Declining, in favour of this call, invitations he had received to Lyons and London,[1] Morus did leave Geneva for Middleburg in July 1649, taking with him the most splendid set of testimonials of character ever given to a migrating divine. His reception in Holland was all that could be desired. People crowded to hear so celebrated a pulpit orator preach; and, before settling at Middleburg, he made a round of visits among the other chief Dutch towns. One of these was to Leyden, to see Salmasius. Here he was waited upon by a deputation from the authorities of Amsterdam to offer him the chair of Sacred History in that city; but he considered himself pledged to Middleburg. In that town, accordingly, he had his abode from 1649 to 1652, as co-pastor in the Walloon Church there, and also Theology Professor. He at once became a leading man in the meetings of the Walloon Synod of the United Provinces, i. e. of that one of the nine Synods of the country which comprised the dispersed French-speaking congregations and their clergy, as distinct from the Dutch-speaking congregations and clergy that formed the other eight. Theological books and sermons of his were already in print in plenty, with some Latin poems.[1]

---

[1] Baillie had been very anxious in 1647 that Morus should be brought to Scotland, and made Principal of St. Leonard's College, St. Andrews. "The man would be an ornament and good instrument in our land" (Letters, III. 6.)

The year 1652, when Morus was thirty-six years of age, was to be a crisis in his life. There had been quarrels at length round him and about him in Middleburg, as there had been at Geneva, and he was meditating a return to his native France, when the magistrates of Amsterdam, hearing of the state of affairs, renewed their offer of the Church History Chair, proposing to make him colleague in the post with David Blondel, whom they had taken in his stead three years before, but who was now getting old. Morus was certainly in Amsterdam on the business of this offer, and Salmasius with him, in April 1652;[2] and, though it was not till July 1652 that he received letters of dismission, at his own request, from the church at Middleburg, he was at leisure for a good part of 1652, before that month, as well as after, to be in the society of Salmasius at Leyden. He seems even to have been a guest in the house of Salmasius or to have been daily there at all hours. Between Salmasius himself and Morus all went well. There was plenty to talk about between them, including Milton's dreadful Book, and the Reply to it vowed by Salmasius in Sweden, but still hanging on hand; there was even a chance of a Chair at Leyden itself for Morus, through the interest of Salmasius. But the head of the household, as we know, was not Salmasius, but Madame Salmasius, that dragoon of a woman, as she is invariably represented, who was always in some fury or other on her husband's behalf or at his expense. In some way or other she and Morus came to deadly feud. The account which Morus himself gives of the affair may be quoted first. "It was not Salmasius," he says, "that was the head of this affair, but his lady-wife, a

---

[1] Bayle's Dict. Art. *Morus;* and "Critical Account of the Life, Character, and Discourses, of Mr. Alexander Morus, by Archibald Bruce, Minister of Whitburn" (Edinb. 1813).

[2] Letter of Gronovius to Nicolas Heinsius: *Burmanni Sylloge Epistolarum,* III. 295.

"woman not only of noble degree but also of notoriety, of "whom it is better to say nothing than to say little. She, "already for some time grievously at enmity with me, and "that for reasons which it is nothing to the purpose to mention, though certainly in no way needing to be blushed for "by me, left no effort untried to force me into the meshes of "a most unsuitable marriage. And, when she felt that the "thing had got publicly known, and that I openly and in the "most vehement manner opposed her intentions, '*I will move* "*Hell to ruin him*,' she said; which is a phrase she often "uses." Her method, Morus goes on to say, was to spread about charges fatal to his ministerial character. The other story is that Madame de Saumaise knew perfectly well what she was about, and had a right to be indignant. She had in her house, as her maid or companion, a young English girl, called familiarly BONTIA; and the report was that Morus, who was an unmarried man, had made love to this girl, and had seduced her under promise of marriage.[1]

The scandal about Morus and Madame de Saumaise's waiting-maid or gentlewoman Bontia was contemporaneous with the publication of the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor*. Accordingly, in that piece of Leyden correspondence in the London *Mercurius Politicus* of Sept. 23–30, which is the first mention of the book I have found, and in which MONSIEUR MORUS is unhesitatingly named as the author, the scandal about Morus and Bontia is fully blazoned. The sentence which we cut short at the end of our extract went on to state, in the plainest terms, the nature of the scandal; and, for the delectation of the readers of *Mercurius Politicus*, there was added a copy of a Latin epigram on the subject, said to be going about in Leyden. It was headed "*Ad Bontiam, Salmasiæ Domesticam, a Moro Gallo Impregnatam*" ("To Bontia, the waiting-maid of Madame Salmasius, with child by the Frenchman Morus"), and ran thus:—

"Galli e concubitu gravidam te, Bontia, Mori
Quis bene moratam morigeramque neget?"

---

[1] More's *Fides Publica*, 1654—5; Milton's Def. Sec.; Bayle's Article *Morus* (one note especially); and Bruce's Life of Morus, chap. IV.

The exact Latin wordplay is untranslateable in English, but this may pass as an equivalent:—

> "With child by Morus, Bontia? Who'll deny
> That we descry
> Your morals more, your breeding more, thereby?"

Although the London *Mercurius Politicus* had unusually early intelligence of the scandal, we hear of it at once in many other quarters. My impression is that Nicolas Heinsius, then away on his second Italian journey, but in constant correspondence with his family in Leyden, was in possession of the substance of the scandal before the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor* had appeared, or at least before he had seen it, and that he had been making merry over it in his letters from Italy back to his various Dutch friends. At all events, from September 1652 onwards, there is a curious jumbling of the two affairs—the scandal about Morus and Bontia, and the speculation whether Morus was the author of the new Salmasian book—in the letters that passed between Heinsius in Italy and three of his friends in particular: Isaac Vossius, now in Amsterdam, John Frederic Gronovius at Deventer, and James Ulitius at the Hague. The witty Heinsius had sent some joke or *double-entendre,* as I guess, to the effect that Morus, in subduing the English girl in Salmasius's house, had shown the great man at least one way to his task of conquering the Britons; and, when it farther appeared that Salmasius and Morus had all the while been laying their heads together for the production of the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor*, the joke was, of course, complicated. The Britons were doubly conquered for Salmasius by his friend Morus! The following dated extracts from the letters themselves will make all this clearer, and are a sample of the sort of gossip that amused learned and celebrated men in those days. I may premise that Milton's blindness was now quite well known abroad. "Such a thick darkness has come over Blondel's eyes [i. e. David Blondel, the colleague of Morus at Amsterdam] that he is all but stone-blind: the same calamity has befallen Milton in England"—so Vossius had written to Heinsius as early as the 19th of July;[1] and on the 1st of September he had repeated the information thus: "I mentioned to you before that Milton had become blind; some even say he is dead.[2]" The report that Milton was *dead* may have prevailed through part of the time of what follows:—

VOSSIUS TO HEINSIUS, *Oct.* 18, 1652:—"Smart and funny what you are keeping back about THE ETHIOP [i.e. Morus, *alias* 'The Moor'] and ANGLA [i.e. 'the English lass.'] But now they are denying the truth of that story, and saying that it has been spread about by malevolent people. For my part, I hold it sufficiently credible that Angla has been as bad as Ethiop. Between him and Salmasius there will probably be a quarrel (for what long concord can there be between such?) on account of a book printed here, called *Clamor Sanguinis Regii in Cœlum.* It seems to have been written by some anonymous Englishman, but transmitted to Salmasius, and published by the Ethiop. There is a contention between them about sixty copies promised by the printer. Ethiop wants them for himself, and has determined to inscribe six copies to our Queen [Christina of Sweden, the patroness of Vossius], and as many to the King of England [Charles II.], other six to the King of France, and so on, even the Queen of Bohemia and the Widow of Orange to have each one or two copies inscribed to her. To the rest of the copies the printer has put his own dedication."[3]

VOSSIUS TO HEINSIUS, *Nov.* 7, 1652:—"Your squib about MORUS, how fine it is, how excellent! Let *me* pass as the author, that he may give me a coin with this inscription, 'Britain Conquered' [*Britannia Subacta*]. But see how ungrateful Salmasius is to the Ethiop, to whom he owes that victory. Because he will not marry the girl, Salmasius is now at him most savagely. The Ethiop, I think, would have done much better if, according to the precept of your favourite Ovid, he had begun with the Mistress. It would have been less pleasant, but he would have got himself much more into favour. The story is everywhere divulged, even in the public London gazettes. There are epigrams about it too.[4]"

ULITIUS TO HEINSIUS, *Nov.* 8, 1652:—"Of Salmasius not a whisper. A book has lately come out, called *Clamor Regii Sanguinis ad Cœlum.* The English, thinking MORUS the author, have overhauled him severely in a late number of a newspaper." Ulitius then quotes the epigram that had appeared in the *Mercurius Politicus.*[5]

---

[1] Burmanni Sylloge Epistolarum, III. 639.

[2] Ibid. III. 643.

[3] Ibid. III. 647—648.

[4] Ibid. III. 649.

[5] Ibid. III. 746. This James Ulitius, I may add, had been in London, as Secretary to the Dutch Embassy, from Dec. 1651 to the time of the departure of the Embassy and the outbreak of the war; and he had made Milton's acquaintance. At least he speaks of his resolution to make it in letters of his of Dec. 1651 and Jan. 1651—2.

GRONOVIUS TO HEINSIUS, *Nov.* 19, 1652:—"There has appeared *Clamor Regii Sanguinis*, without the name of the author; whom, however, I easily understand to be MORUS. Though he wishes it to appear that the production is purely his gift to the cause, it is sufficiently evident that it is a gift rather to his host and patron, by way of a slight cold bath to MILTON, in anticipation of the sea or lake of charges which the great one himself is getting ready from all quarters."[1]

VOSSIUS TO HEINSIUS, *Nov.* 24, 1652:—"Of Salmasius I have nothing at all to tell you. I believe he has been suffering from his usual illness. Somebody told me, however, that he is now a little better. He is at feud with MORUS. For he insists that Morus shall marry his English girl, and Morus won't. The two good lovers themselves, lately so sweet and friendly, are now in bitter mutual enmity. About four days ago, the Moor chancing to meet our fair one in the large square near the house of Salmasius, she was at his hair in an instant, and struck him several blows; and, not content with that, she would have been at him furiously with a stick, had not the good fellow taken refuge in a barn and defended himself with clods of turf. To this sight there was not wanting a vast number of spectators, who had gathered to the spot from the whole neighbourhood. You see how all in that house are under feminine rule. You may easily guess therefore that all the rumours must have been false about the subduing of the she-Briton (*de 'subactâ Britannicâ'*), as she has rather subdued the Moor. At least, it appears, if the tale is true, that she has not been subdued sufficiently."[2]

HEINSIUS TO GRONOVIUS, *Dec.* 10, 1652:—"I request you to commend me to all friends. Health to *them;* to ALASTOR [one of the names for Salmasius] a gallows and a halter, and we shall have a meeting about his hide when I return. His chum, the Ethiop, has had a triumph, as I hear, in his friend's house, in the matter of subduing the Britons (*de subactis Britannis*). The London Gazettes have a fine little story. Alastor regrets that the palm of such a victory should have been snatched from himself; wherefore, if report is to be believed, he is now in strenuous rivalry with the Ethiop."[3]

VOSSIUS TO HEINSIUS, *Dec.* 12, 1652:—"MORUS has called the English girl into Court; his aim is to convict her of lying. The friendship between him and Salmasius is almost at an end."[4]

VOSSIUS TO HEINSIUS, *Jan.* 1, 1652-3:—"MORUS has called SALMASIUS into Court, with his whole household. When I know the result of the lawsuit, you shall hear of it. I pray for long life for Salmasius, that he may know he has not injured me in vain."[5]

---

[1] Burmanni Sylloge Epistolarum, III. 303.

[2] Ibid. III. 654.

[3] Ibid. III. 305.

[4] Ibid. III. 658.

[5] Ibid. III. 660.

A copy of the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor* had duly reached Milton. He had even been favoured with early sheets. Ulac, the printer of the book at the Hague, was quite a man of business, and was in constant commercial correspondence with Hartlib in London. Ever since the European success of Milton's Reply to Salmasius, accordingly, he had been anxious to obtain something of Milton's to print; and he had latterly been conveying that desire to Milton through Hartlib and others, with intimations that he had now greater printing facilities than previously—larger fonts of type, &c. Milton's message back, by the same channel, had been that he had nothing at present by him needing the press. All this must have been before the manuscript of the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor* had come into Ulac's hands; and it is even possible that, after the manuscript was in his hands, his wish to be on civil terms with Milton may have helped in the delay of putting it to press. Nay, when the war between the Dutch and the English had broken out, and all hesitation as to printing the tremendous attack on the English Parricides was at an end, had not Ulac done all that a tradesman could? Had he not informed Hartlib of what was coming, and sent over to Hartlib, week by week, the single sheets of the book, "wet from the press," making tender inquiries at the same time as to the state of Milton's eyes, and whether his sight was totally gone, and hinting that, if Milton should write an answer to the book, he would be happy to print the foreign edition? Had not Hartlib more than once thanked Ulac for the polite attention? These are undoubted facts, with the exception that among the advance "wet sheets" sent over to London there cannot have been that prefixed Dedication to the Book, in Ulac's own name, and bearing his signature, in which there were such insults to Milton personally and such sneers about his inferiority to the great Salmasius. The thanks to Ulac cannot have included *that*. Indeed, when complete copies of the book came over, Hartlib and Milton's other friends, reading the Dedication for the first time, had been surprised and indignant. Then Ulac's explanation was ready enough. The Dedication was in his name, but he had not written a line of it. It had been sent him by Salmasius himself, probably at the last moment, to be prefixed to the book. But why had Ulac, after what had passed, consented to let such a thing go forth in his own name? To the remonstrances of Hartlib and others from London on this point Ulac had replied that they were very ignorant of business, not at all men of the world. "I am a Printer," he said: "what have Printers to do with great controversies, unless to make profit out of them?" As a Printer, he had obliged Salmasius in the matter of the Dedication, and he would be glad to oblige Milton in any similar way in the same capacity.[1]

These facts known to Milton, with much besides, and the book having been read over to him as often as he required, and most probably by his nephew John Phillips, the natural question was about a Reply. That there should be *some* Reply was inevitable. It was hardly in Milton's nature to let any such thing pass unnoticed; and, even had he been less disposed generally to reply to opponents than he was, he would necessarily have been moved in this particular instance. But we have his own distinct information that he had orders to prepare a Reply. Besides the private copy of the book sent in sheets to Hartlib by Ulac for Milton's use, two other early copies, it seems, had come into his hands officially. "A copy of the book, hardly complete in its sheets," he says, "was delivered to me in the Council of State; and shortly "afterwards another was sent to me by the Committee of "Examinations then in office for the Council (*ab eo Consessu* "*qui Quæstionibus tum præfuit*); and it was signified that "I was expected to perform for the Commonwealth the service "of stopping the mouth of this importunate *Caller*." In other words, just as Milton had been commissioned to write his *Eikonoklastes* in reply to the *Eikon Basilike*, and his *Defensio pro Populo Anglicano* in reply to the *Defensio Regia* of Salmasius, so now he was commissioned to reply to the anonymous

---

[1] Ulac's statement in his Preface to the Hague Edition of Milton's *Def. Sec.* (1654); and two statements by Milton himself—one in the text of the *Def. Sec.*, and one in his *Def. pro Se* (1655).

Regii Sanguinis Clamor. The task was to be performed effectively enough in time, though not immediately. The reasons for the delay are stated by himself. "At that time," he continues, "I was at the very worst, under the pressure of "a severe anxiety occasioned by diverse causes at once—infirm "health, the domestic grief of two funerals, and the now total "loss of my eyesight; and, moreover, outside there was im-"pending that prior adversary of mine [Salmasius himself] to "whom preference was to be decidedly given over this one,— "which prior adversary was threatening more and more every "day an attack upon me with his whole strength." On all these grounds, Milton gives us to understand, he was in no hurry to execute his commission of replying to the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor*, but kept the task in reserve.[1]

"The domestic grief of two funerals" ("*duorum funerum luctus domesticus*"): here, if I mistake not, we have dated for us two deaths in Milton's household, the registers of which otherwise have not yet been found—that of his wife, and that of his infant son, John. Phillips's statement is that the death of the wife was "in childbed" and in the house in Petty France; which, as there was no child after the daughter Deborah, born May 2, 1652, would point to that month, or the next, or perhaps the next after that, as the date of the death. Milton's words would correspond; for it was in August or September 1652 that the first copies of the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor* reached England. He was then, we may infer, in the second or third month of his widowhood. But there had been more than one death in the household. As the little Deborah survived, and as the two elder daughters also survived, we seem bound to conclude that this other death, happening close to that of the mother, was that of the third child and only boy, born in Scotland Yard, March 16, 1650–1, and respecting whom Phillips's information merely is that, through bad nursing, he died an infant. The three young daughters remained for Milton; but, some time between May and October 1652, the mother and the little son had both been buried. It is possible that the deaths may not have taken place in the house in Petty France, for there is no register of them, any more than of the birth of the youngest child, Deborah, in the parish-books of St. Margaret's, Westminster. And so, in a kind of haze as to time and place, but early in Milton's total blindness, when his enemies were encircling him most closely, and he was weakest and most helpless against them, we see the last of poor Mary Powell. She was but twenty-six years of age, and she had been Milton's wife for nine years.[1]

---

[1] The quotations in this paragraph are from Milton's *Pro Se Defensio,* published in 1655.

One of Milton's Latin Familiar Epistles comes in at this point. It is to Richard Heath, one of his old pupils (Vol. III. p. 657), and must, of course, have been dictated:—

"To Richard Heath.

"If I have ever been able, my much respected Friend, to give aid, whether in promoting your studies or in procuring furtherance in them—and such aid has assuredly been either nothing or very slight—I am glad on more than one account that it should have been bestowed so well and fortunately on a nature of such promise, though known rather late, and that it has been so fruitful as to have produced an upright pastor of the church, a good citizen of his country, and at the same time an agreeable friend for myself. All this I am easily sure of, both from the rest of your life and your excellent state of sentiment about Religion and State, and also, and especially, from that singular affectionateness of your mind which can be extinguished or lessened by no amount of absence, no lapse of time. Nor is it possible, unless you had made more than ordinary progress in virtue and piety and in study of the best things, that you should be so grateful to those who have conferred even the least assistance towards those acquisitions. Wherefore, my Pupil (for I willingly call you by that name, if you allow it), I would have you believe that you have a high place in my regards, and that nothing would be more desirable for me than that, if your convenience and your plans permitted (and this I see to be also in your own wishes), you should be able to live somewhere near me, so that there might be more frequent and pleasant intercourse of life and studies between us. But of that as God pleases and you find expedient! Further, as to what you say about writing in English, do so if you please (though you have really made no small advance in Latin), lest at any time the trouble of writing should make either of us slow to write, and in order that our ideas, not being bound by any fetters of an alien speech, may the more freely express themselves. You will, I believe, with the greatest propriety entrust your letters to any one of the servants of the family I have mentioned to you. Farewell.

---

[1] Curiously enough, there is the burial of a "Mary Powell" under date Nov. 13, 1652, in the parish registers of St. Margaret's, Westminster. Powells are very numerous in the registers; which proves that there were several families of the name in the parish. They seem to have been in no way connected with *our* Powells. There were also Miltons in the parish besides *our* Milton. The birth of a "Henry Milton, son to Robert by Susan," occurs in the registers under April 29, 1652; and there is a "Robert Milton" among the deaths of Jan. 1653—4, and a "Henry Mylton" among those of the following March.

Westminster, December 13, 1652."

Before the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor* had appeared there had been in progress, in Milton's house, a Reply to that much more contemptible contribution to the Salmasian controversy which had been published at Antwerp in the previous year under the title of *Apologia contra Johannis Polypragmatici, alias Miltoni Angli, Defensionem* (ante pp. 347–348). The rumour still prevailing that the book was partly Bramhall's, Milton, though he had resolved to take no direct trouble about it himself, was quite willing that his nephew, John Phillips, who wanted some such opportunity for fleshing his maiden pen, should try what he could do on this *vile corpus*. Phillips, in fact, had volunteered, and Milton had encouraged him, given him suggestions, and made him read the pages aloud as he went on, with a view to the correction of the Latin and general improvement of the whole, but still so that the result should be substantially Phillips's, and might bear his name. The book, so prepared, was out in London on the 24th of December, 1652, with this title, "*Joannis Philippi Angli Responsio ad Apologiam Anonymi Cujusdam Tenebrionis pro Rege et Populo Anglicano Infantissimam. Londini, Typis Du-gardianis, An. Dom. MDCLII*" ("*Answer of John Phillips, Englishman, to the most silly Apology of some Anonymous Sneak for the King and People of England. London, Dugard's Press,* 1652").[1] It is a small octavo of 258 pages, printed in very sparse type. The Introduction is, for us, the most vital part, and may be represented by a few selected passages:—

---

[1] In a copy in the British Museum the insertion "i. e. Milton's Amanuensis)" is written after the words "*Joannis Philippi*" in the title-page. The date of the publication is from the Thomason Catalogue.

"In reply to the famous book of an anonymous writer in which the Parliament and People of England were attacked with the foulest revilings, a book now commonly known to have been the infamous work of Salmasius the Grammarian, there came forth lately the Defence of John Milton, Englishman, for his Country. A book truly good, and much approved by the judgment of all learned men at home and abroad! Such being its character, an answer from Salmasius himself or some other learned man was expected. It was certainly much for the interest of that party to have employed some choice and eloquent man upon their long labouring and tottering cause. But lo! at length, out of all those mountains of rumour, which fame was constantly bringing to our ears, there has crept forth this little mouse, who only squeaks and gnaws; or, to speak more truly, he does nibble little morsels and tires his teeth on one another, but certainly does his author no harm, and does not even understand the force and bearing of his arguments. . . . Being such, he was justly neglected and despised by Milton himself. It was much beneath the acknowledged writing ability of that polished and cultured author, as all thought, to descend to scratching mud, and refuting the rapid loquacity of so rash and foolish a babbler. But, in case the empty pettifogger should give himself airs among his fellow refugees, and believe himself to have written anything great, or worth even one little dinner, I, induced thereto by regard for my country, and by love of the liberty lately established among us, and also bound by many ties of duty to that man, always to be venerated by me, who is the object of his attack, could not refrain from taking upon myself, without so much as being asked to do so, the task of quelling the petulance of this most silly rascal. Accordingly, just as of old the Roman tiros exercised themselves little by little at first in swords and javelins, so I trust I may not unfitly make a criticism of *him* the means of sharpening my stiff style and exhibiting the rudiments of an intellect scarcely yet in its full youth ('*ingenii vixdum pubescentis rudimenta*'). . . . Before I begin the work itself, then, it seems worth while to find out, please the gods, who the illustrious and eloquent author of this Apology is, who nevertheless lurks in the dark. Some say he is one JANE ['*nomen illi* JANO *esse*'), an obscure and illiterate person, of the order of lawyers called solicitors. But, remembering that Janus was two-fronted, I concluded that another forehead had to be sought in his backhead. Accordingly, the name of that other forehead, as I have ascertained by certain evidences, is BRAMHALL. He lately wrote in English a book against the *Eikonoklastes* ['*Eikon Aklastos: or, The Image Unbroken,*' &c.: see ante pp. 349–350], almost the twin of this in style and sense; and many, without being rash, think this also his production. Please then to know something of the man, though he here carries his face in the back of his head. For, as he professes, he is Doctor of Theology and an Irish Bishop. He, from his early age a loose man and given to drink, having before his eyes the luxury, wealth, and ambition of the Bishops who then ruled in England, and being pressed by need and the instinct of a barking stomach, thought nothing would be better for him than to take the office of priest and get into the Church, then open indeed to every wolf. [A farther sketch, in the same strain, of Bramhall's life, and of his successive promotions till Strafford made him Bishop of Derry, with a notice of his fall from that elevation in the ruin of Episcopacy and his present state of needy exile]. . . . And let us see whence this *Apology* of his comes. From Antwerp! for here alone, it seems, that illustrious Protestant Bishop could find an asylum for himself, among herds of Jesuits and monks, with whom such false Bishops are very willing to associate. Very properly and worthily, in my opinion, act these foreign Protestants who drive off wandering disturbers of that sort from their meetings. At all events, he did not dare to print this little work of his in any Dutch city, fearing that the most illustrious States of the Federation, as they lately condemned in public the book of their own Salmasius, would punish much more severely an exiled and wandering scamp like him."

Proceeding to the criticism of the Apology itself, Phillips pursues it through its Preface and its twelve Chapters successively, culling out and quoting in italic type phrases here and there, abusive of Milton, or eulogistic of Salmasius, or containing little points of argument, and administering to each phrase some brief but smartish comment. In Chapter I. the statement of the writer of the Apology that he would "*leave Milton in most things to the castigation of Salmasius*" leads Phillips into details which he must have derived from Milton. "Salmasius castigate Milton"? he exclaims. Why, if only the world knew the effect, the absolutely prostrating effect, of Milton's book on Salmasius when he first read it in Stockholm! Nobody could go near him at first; and his rage, on partly recovering himself, and perceiving how he had fallen in repute with Queen Christina, had vented itself in such mere incoherences as "*I will send the Blackguard and the whole Parliament to perdition*"![1] But let Salmasius reappear personally when he liked; the present business was with this Apologist! That Phillips got tired of the task of following him closely appears when we reach Chapter VII. "And now," the Chapter opens, "we have run through the half of "your most futile book, and, though long ago we have found "you, by more evidence than enough, unlearned, insipid, a "blunderer in Latin, arrogant and languid, yet the further "we proceed the more inane and lean you always turn out, "and, with the exception of some commonplace adages and "distichs, which you had learnt by heart, I believe, when a "schoolboy, and which, to prevent your readers from denying "you some little sort of half-scholarship, you labour to insert "by hook or crook, you seem to have exhausted all the rest "of your very small provision of arguments, sense, and Latin." Over the remaining chapters, therefore, Phillips skims rapidly. In the last there is a biting return to the subject of the horribly bad Latin of the Apologist, with a collection of some of his more glaring solecisms by way of specimen. "*Tam castus ut exemplum præbuit,*" "*Toties purgatum ut nil præter nomen manere potest,*" "*Tanto acumine ut maxima pars mundi mirantur et silent,*" are three instances given of one habitual blunder throughout the book. The wonder is that a man so ill-taught his *ut* could have written a book in Latin at all; but another wonder is that Milton or Phillips could have supposed such Latin to have come from Bramhall.

---

[1] See ante pp. 317, 318; and note how accurately the Stockholm gossip of Vossius and others had reached Milton.

Edward Phillips, in his mention of this maiden book of his brother's, distinctly says that it received from Milton himself "such exact emendations before it went to press that "it might very well have passed for *his*, but that he was "willing the person that took the pains to prepare it for his "examination and polishment should have the name and "credit of being the author."[1] My impression, not quite inconsistent with this, is that the *matter* of the book was essentially and throughout Phillips's own. With signs in it of a certain early constitutional coarseness, it was not uncreditable to so young a man. Wood's notice of it is characteristic. After speaking of John Phillips as one who had "early

---

[1] Phillips's Memoir of Milton, 1694.

"imbibed in a most plentiful manner the rankest antimonarchical principles from that villainous leading incendiary, "John Milton, his uncle, but not in any university," he admits that in the "scurrilous piece" written in his uncle's defence "he acquitted himself very expertly in the art of "raillery and giving imbittered language."[1]

But what was the anonymous *Apologia* of 1651, which Phillips had thus answered, in comparison with the anonymous *Regii Sanguinis Clamor*, published but the other day and now in circulation? If there was to be an Answer to that, it must be by Milton himself. One cause of his deferring the matter, as he has already told us, was his expectation, from day to day, of the reappearance in print of Salmasius himself, and his consequent hope of being able to deal with principal and second both at once. Of the real state of affairs in that respect from January to April 1653 the following additional extracts afford the most authentic glimpse:—

HEINSIUS (*from Florence*) TO GRONOVIUS (*in Deventer*), *Jan.* 7, 1652–3:—"I had understood the *Clamor Regii Sanguinis* to be by some Englishman, but edited by Morus. The 'Parricides,' however, consider Morus the author of that book, and have been very hard upon him in the London Gazettes, on the assumption of his having seduced Alastor's waiting-maid, adding this epigram [the Latin epigram is here quoted from *Mercurius Politicus*]. You recognise a trifle of the Owenian spice [is the reference to John Owen, the English Epigrammatist in Latin, b. 1560, d. 1622?] in this thing, which has been conveyed me by our hero Ulitius [ante p. 464: does Heinsius mean to hint that the epigram was his own, though Ulitius did not know it, nor Gronovius till now?]. I eagerly expect Alastor's book against the English, though I doubt not there will be there some commitee-holding at my expense. So he promised, at all events, when he let people put it into his head that Milton had been armed by me. I keep my Scazons lying in ambush, ready to fly forth as soon as I have learnt that he is giving me a place in those dirty pages of his."[2]

VOSSIUS (*from Amsterdam*) TO HEINSIUS (*now in Venice*), *Jan.* 31, 1652–3:—"Salmasius is over head and ears in his answer to Milton. The book, which will not be less in bulk than the former one, has begun to be printed. He calls Milton throughout a . . . . [an unutterable epithet about Milton, especially referring to his conduct in Italy during his tour there in 1638–9]. He criticises minutely also Milton's Latin Verses. The rupture, too, between him and Morus increases daily, especially since Morus called the English lass into court. He is furious also on another account, namely because Morus has called him a cuckold. Morus, on the other hand, appears now to be vastly anxious for our friendship. Two days ago I had him to dine with me at the Hague; he then told me some most capital things both about Salmasius and Xantippe. He greatly desires that *you* would be down upon Salmasius with your Scazons. . . . For some time past Salmasius has begun to try to keep his Xantippe in order; but how she will bear that new usurpation many would fain know."[1]

---

[1] Wood's Ath. IV. 764.

[2] Burmanni Sylloge Epistolarum, III. 307.

VOSSIUS (*from Amsterdam*) TO HEINSIUS, *Feb.* 14, 1652–3:—"Morus and Madame Salmasius are here in public altercation in Court about the Helen of the case. I know not the issue as yet. Salmasius has collected testimonies from all quarters towards proving that Morus is a thorough profligate. He is said to have the testimony of one or more maidservants whom Morus wanted to seduce. What would you not give to be present in the Court at such an exquisite disputation?"[2]

HEINSIUS (*from Venice*) TO VOSSIUS (*in Amsterdam*), *Feb.* 28, 1652–3:—"I had believed Milton dead, as you certainly reported. But it is better that he should be alive, that sycophants may match sycophants. Holstenius [see Vol. I. pp. 747–751 and 770–771] showed me his Poems. They have no pretence to elegance. He blunders frequently in prosody. A wide field is therefore open here for the criticism of Salmasius. But with what face will *he* comment on the verses of others, his own muse being so wretchedly shabby. What he says about Milton's conduct in Italy is mere calumny. I wish his own cheeks were as safe from his wife's nails as Milton is from that imputation. That Englishman was even disliked by the Italians, among whom he lived a long time, on account of his too severe morals, though he would freely dispute about religion, and hit out strongly against the Pope on any occasion."[3]

Mere old spite and gossip much of this, though essential here in explanation of what has yet to come. But what a gleam in the last-quoted letter of Heinsius back through fourteen years! Here was the sprightly Dutch wit and scholar, at the age of thirty-two, again in Italy, and enjoying his renewed acquaintance with the Italian scholars and wits whom he had met in his previous visit six years before, and who were the very same persons that had been so hospitable to Milton in *his* Italian visit eight years before that. There was Holstenius at Rome, still librarian of the Vatican; at Florence or near it there were Carlo Dati, Jacopo Gaddi, Frescobaldi, Coltellini, Chimentelli, and Francini; in both cities, and elsewhere, there were others and others.[1] Moving among these, Heinsius finds the recollection fresh among them of the fair-haired Englishman who had once been so much in their society, and of whose subsequent career, and especially of his conflict with Salmasius, they had heard by recent rumour. Heinsius adds to their information; and the whole entanglement of the Milton-Morus-Salmasius business, with the ferocious charges against Milton in the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor*, and the more hideous charges against him of special misconduct in Italy which Salmasius was said to be putting to press, becomes a topic of talk in the Italian clubs. On the last head, Heinsius is able to report, he receives but one verdict from all the Italians that had known Milton. Salmasius had better not try that style of attack! The recollection of Milton in Italy was that he would have been liked better if he had not been so unpleasantly strict and Puritanical, so given to serious religious discussion, and so outspoken and incessant against the poor Pope. Surely from two of the Florentine group, at least, Heinsius would hear accounts of Milton more enthusiastic than this, and less merely negative. If Dati and Francini did not stand up manfully for Milton, and even astound Heinsius with their praises of him, what faith can there ever be more in Italian panegyrics and vows of friendship?[2]

---

[1] Burmanni Sylloge Epistolarum, III. 662—3.

[2] Ibid. III. 665.

[3] Ibid. III. 669.

To the blind Milton on the banks of the Thames, not unconscious perhaps of the talk thus going on about him among his old friends in Italy, there had adhered, just at this moment, a new English friend, who was to be faithful to the last. This was ANDREW MARVELL.

Born at Winestead, near Hull, March 31, 1621, the son of the parson of that parish, but brought up in Hull itself, where his father became master of the Grammar School, and minister of one of the town churches, Marvell had entered Trinity

---

[1] Vol. I. pp. 721—755.

[2] See Vol. I. pp. 732—734; Vol. II. 90; Vol. III. 651—654, 680—683, and 690—691.

College, Cambridge, in 1633, had taken his B.A. degree in 1638–9, but had not proceeded farther in the University. After having been an unusually long time abroad, on the travels then thought necessary to complete a young man's education, he had returned home in or about 1646. In 1650 he had become tutor to Mary Fairfax, only child of the great Fairfax; and he had resided in this capacity at Fairfax's house of Nunappleton in Yorkshire for about two years, not only teaching languages to "little Moll," as her father called her, but also seeing much of Lord Fairfax himself in his happy retirement among his books (ante pp. 194–146). Towards the end of 1652, however, Marvell had left Nunappleton and the Fairfax tutorship, and was in London in quest of other employment. He was then thirty-one years of age, with a decided talent for literature, and a little stock of pieces already written, both in English and Latin. "*Upon the Hill and Grove at Bilborow,*" and "*Upon Appleton House,*" were two English poems of a sweet and quiet descriptive kind, in the measure of "L'Allegro" and "Il Penseroso," that had been written amid the scenery of Nunappleton and addressed to Fairfax; in *An Horatian Ode upon Cromwell's Return from Ireland* there had been strokes of a still more peculiar poetical strength; while in a rougher vein of mere satire there were three pieces of rhymed heroics, entitled "*Fleckno, an English Priest at Rome,*" "*Tom May's Death,*" and "*The Character of Holland.*" As far as one can guess from these pieces, Republicanism had not been Marvell's original bent in politics. Thus in the *Horatian Ode to Cromwell* (June 1650) there is a curious blending of admiration for Cromwell on the whole with a loyal respect for the memory of the late King. Of Charles on the scaffold he says :—

> "He nothing common did or mean
> Upon that memorable scene,
>   But with his keener eye
>   The axe's edge did try;
>
> Nor called the Gods, with vulgar spite,
> To vindicate his helpless right;
>   But bowed his comely head
>   Down as upon a bed."

Yet about Cromwell the strain throughout is as follows:—

> "'Tis madness to resist or blame
> The force of angry Heaven's flame;
> And, if we would speak true,
> Much to the man is due
>
> Who from his private gardens, where
> He lived reservèd and austere,
> As if his highest plot
> To plant the bergamot,
>
> Could by industrious valour climb
> To ruin the great work of Time,
> And cast the kingdoms old
> Into another mould."

The society of Fairfax since 1650 may have given a turn to Marvell's views of things, leaving him still to think as he pleased of the act of regicide on which the Commonwealth had been founded, but reconciling him to the Commonwealth as existing. In his *Character of Holland*, at all events, written late in 1652 or early in 1653, the allegiance to the Commonwealth is complete.

> "For now of nothing may our State despair,
> Darling of Heaven, and of men the care;
> Provided that they be, what they have been,
> Watchful abroad, and honest still within;
> For, while our Neptune doth a trident shake,
> Steeled with those piercing heads, Dean, Monk, and Blake,
> And while Jove governs in the highest sphere,
> Vainly in Hell let Pluto domineer."[1]

Such was the remarkable man who, by introduction from Fairfax, or in some less distinguished way, had become acquainted with the blind Milton in his house in Petty France. The consequence appears in the following letter of Milton's, addressed to Bradshaw, the original of which, in the hand of some boy to whom it had been dictated, still exists:—

"My Lord,

But that it would be an interruption to the public, wherein your studies are perpetually employed, I should now and then venture to supply this my enforced absence with a line or two, though it were my only business (and that would be no slight one) to make my due acknowledgments of your many favours. Which I both do at this time and ever shall; and have this farther which I thought my part to let you know of—that there will be with you to-morrow, upon some occasion of business, a gentleman whose name is MR. MARVELL: a man whom, both by report and the converse I have had with him, [I can recommend as] of singular desert for the State to make use of; who also offers himself if there be any employment for him. His father was the minister of Hull; and he hath spent four years abroad in Holland, France, Italy, and Spain, to very good purpose, as I believe, and the gaining of these four languages: besides, he is a scholar and well read in the Latin and Greek authors, and no doubt of an approved conversation, for he comes now lately out of the house of the Lord Fairfax, who was General, where he was entrusted to give some instruction in the languages to the lady his daughter. If, upon the death of Mr. Weckherlin, the Council shall think that I shall need any assistant in the performance of my place (though for my part I find no encumbrance of that which belongs to me, except it be in point of attendance at conferences with Ambassadors, which I must confess in my condition I am not fit for), it would be hard for them to find a man so fit every way for that purpose as this gentleman—one who, I believe, in a short time would be able to do them as good service as Mr. Ascham. This, my Lord, I write sincerely, without any other end than to perform my duty to the public in helping them to an able servant,—laying aside those jealousies and that emulation which mine own condition might suggest to me by bringing in such a coadjutor,—and remain,

---

[1] "Memorial Introduction," by the Rev. A. B. Grosart to his edition (the first perfect one) of the works of Marvell, 1872—74; also the Poems named, as given in that edition; also Markham's Life of Fairfax, 367—368.

My Lord, your most obliged and faithful servant,
For the Honourable the Lord Bradshaw. JOHN MILTON."
Feb. the 21, 1652 [1652-3].[1]

At this date, then, Weckherlin, already for some time off duty, was dead or on the point of death, and the Council were considering, or were likely to consider, whether some one else should be brought in as Milton's assistant in his place, or whether Milton might not now get on sufficiently well by himself. Milton avows himself capable of all the work, with the exception of attendances on Ambassadors, &c.; but if the Council take the other view, he has found, he tells Bradshaw, the very man for them. He thinks so highly of Mr. Marvell, he says, that he might even be jealous of the consequences to himself, in his disabled condition, of bringing such a rival into the Council-office.—Whatever action Bradshaw may have taken on Milton's letter, Marvell, we have to add, was not, for the present, appointed. Indeed, within two months of the date of the letter, Cromwell had dissolved the Parliament, and the Council of State had ceased to exist. On the morning of the 20th of April, 1653, Thurloe was General Secretary to the Council of State, with £800 a year; Walter Frost, Assistant General Secretary, with £365 a year; and Milton, Secretary for Foreign Tongues, with £288 a year; but whether they were to be continued in the public employment, and in what capacities, and with what salaries, depended, from that day, on Cromwell.

---

[1] Original in Record Office, probably because Bradshaw brought it before the Council; printed by Todd (pp. 102—103 of "Life" in edition of Milton's Poems of 1852), by Mr. Hamilton in his *Milton Papers*, pp. 22—23, and by Mr. Grosart in Memorial Introduction to his "Marvell." From a false idea that the original was in Milton's autograph, Todd, neglecting other evidence, argued that Milton was not quite blind in the beginning of 1653. But the original is not in Milton's hand, but in that of a rather ignorant amanuensis, who spells Marvell's name as *Marvile*, Weckherlin's as *Wakerley*, and Ascham's as *Ascan*. I have rectified these and other slips.

This Chapter would be incomplete without an inventory of the Latin State Papers done by Milton for the Council or the Parliament during the period over which it extends. The following is such an Inventory, in continuation of our prior Inventories from the beginning of his Secretaryship.

(XX.) TO FERDINAND II., GRAND-DUKE OF TUSCANY, *Jan.* 20, 1651–2:—Letter in name of the Parliament, signed by Speaker Lenthall, in answer at last to the Grand-Duke's friendly letters, of date April 22, 1651, which had been delivered, May 15, by his agent Salvetti (ante p. 422). The Grand-Duke's desires of commercial amity between Tuscany and the Commonwealth are cordially reciprocated.

SAFEGUARD FROM THE COMMONWEALTH FOR THE COUNT OF OLDENBURG'S SUBJECTS, *Feb.* 17, 1651–2[1]:—An account of this document, with our reasons for including it among Milton's Latin State Papers, though it does not appear in the Skinner

---

[1] Thurloe, I. 385—6, where it is undated and out of its place: date ascertained by Commons Journals.

Manuscript, in the Printed Edition, or in Phillips, has already been given (ante p. 424). In the circumstances, I leave it unnumbered.

(XXI.) LETTER TO THE COUNT OF OLDENBURG, ACCOMPANYING THE SAFEGUARD, *same date* :[1]—Signed by Henry Scobell, as Clerk of the Parliament. The Letter explains the delay in acknowledging the Count's peculiarly gracious congratulations of the Commonwealth and his application for the Safeguard. Both had been duly received through the Count's agent, Hermann Mylius; and the delay had been by no fault of that gentleman, "whose solicitations were daily and earnest, with all the diligence and importunity that became him, to the end that he might be despatched with the business accomplished to his mind." It had been owing to the occupation of the Parliament and Council in great and weighty affairs; and the Count will kindly not put a wrong construction upon it.—The careful consideration of the feelings and interests of Mylius in the wording of the Letter suggests that Milton had drafted the English original, which Whitlocke read to the House, and which the House ordered to be translated into Latin (ante p. 424).

(XXII.) TO CHRISTINA, QUEEN OF SWEDEN, *March* 11, 1651–2 :—Letter, signed by Speaker Lenthall for the Parliament, and despatched to Stockholm by special messenger, condoling with her Swedish Majesty on the death of her agent Silvercron immediately after his arrival in London (ante pp. 377–378), saying how gladly the Parliament had welcomed this commencement of friendly intercourse between her and the Commonwealth, and hoping it would be continued.[2]

(XXIII.) TO THE SPANISH AMBASSADOR, DON ALONSO DE CARDENAS, *March* 21, 1651–2[3]:—A rather haughty letter from the Council of State, written by order of Parliament of March 2, in reply to a Paper from the Ambassador of Feb. 15. The Council have done all they could in compliance with the Ambassador's desires, have given him an audience, have appointed a Committee at his request to treat with him; and yet the only result is this Paper of two preliminary heads. The answer, in effect, is that the Ambassador must be more explicit.

(XXIV.) TO FREDERICK III., KING OF DENMARK, *April* 13, 1652[4]:—Letter from the Parliament, signed by the Speaker, acknowledging friendly letters from his Majesty, dated "Copenhagen, Dec. 21–1651," and received through Henry Willemsen

---

[1] No. 117 in Skinner Transcript, and given also in the Printed Collection and in Phillips; but undated and confusingly out of place in all three. Date ascertained from Commons Journals.

[2] Not in Skinner Transcript and dated only by the month in the Printed Collection. Exact date ascertained from Commons Journals.

[3] Not in Skinner Transcript: dated "March 21, 1652" in Printed Collection, and in Phillips. *Certainly* for "March 21, 1651—2."

[4] Dated by month only in Printed Collection: not found in Skinner Transcript. Exact date from Commons Journals.

Rosenwing de Lysacker. The Parliament hope they are but a prelude to closer treaty. In fact, within a month, the two Ambassadors Extraordinary from Denmark were announced (ante p. 378).

(XXV.) TO THE PROCONSULS AND SENATES OF THE HANSE TOWNS, *April* 16, 1652:—Letter from the Speaker in name of the Parliament, saying that they have welcomed the advent of an agent of such prudence and probity as Leo de Aitzema, and have referred him for more particular negotiation to the Council of State (ante pp. 378–379).

(XXVI.) TO THE SENATE OF HAMBURG, *same date as last*[1]:—Almost a duplicate of the last, Aitzema having a special mission from Hamburg, besides his mission from the Hanse Towns generally (ante p. 379).

(XXVII.) BILL OF CLAIMS UPON THE UNITED PROVINCES FOR OLD DAMAGES DONE TO ENGLISH TRADERS BY THE DUTCH, *June* 1652 (?)[2]:—Of this curious bill, which seems to have been presented to the Dutch Ambassador Extraordinary, Pauw, and the presentation of which was almost the signal for the war (ante p. 374), Milton must have been the Translator only. It consists of two parts—a *Summarium Damnorum* in six items, with the figures opposite each in the margin, amounting in all to £220,796 15*s.*; and another and vaster *Summarium Damnorum,* in four items, amounting in all to £1,461,020: the grand total being £1,681,816 15*s.*

? DECLARATION OF THE CAUSES OF WAR WITH THE DUTCH, *July* 1652:—This is the great document prepared in English by the Council of State on the rupture of the treaty with Pauw and the rest of the Dutch Ambassadors, adopted by the Parliament, July 7, (ante p. 374), and then referred to the Council for translation into Latin, French, and Dutch. Thurloe had been instructed by the Council to appoint fit persons for the three translations (ante 447). All three, as well as the English original, were duly printed and published for European circulation. Augier may have done the French one, and Haak the Dutch; but who did the Latin one? Copies of it are still extant, with this title: *Scriptum Parlamenti Reipublicæ Angliæ de iis quæ ab hac Repub. cum Potestatibus Fœderatarum Belgii Provinciarum Generalibus, et quibus Progressibus, acta sunt, &c. Londini, Typis Du-Gardianis, anno Domini,* 1652. Mr. W. Douglas Hamilton, who has very properly started this question (*Milton Papers,* 20–21), has no doubt that the Translator was Milton. One of his arguments is that "so early as the 26th of June, 1650, we find it ordered that the Declaration of Parliament 'be translated into Latin by Mr. Milton, into Dutch by Mr. Haak, and into French by Monsieur

---

[1] Not in Skinner Transcript. Date of order of Parliament for signing both this and the last, April 13.

[2] Inserted, both in the Printed Edition and in Phillips, at the end of the State-Letters of the Commonwealth Period proper: not given in the Skinner Transcript.

Augier.'" *That* Declaration, however, was not the present one at all, but a Declaration of War with the Scots, at a time when there was no thought of a War with the Dutch (ante p. 228). Hence the belief that Milton was the Latin translator on the present occasion must rest on other grounds—the natural probability that he should be; the fact that Thurloe, by order of the Council, sent Dugard to Milton for instructions about the printing of the Declaration generally (ante p. 447); and the internal evidence furnished by the Latinity. Not having examined this last evidence when the pamphlet was accessible to me, I will not be positive on the question; but I am inclined to believe that Mr. Hamilton is right, and that the Latin of this important "Declaration" (including an account of Blake's first naval battle with Van Tromp) was one of Milton's services to the Commonwealth. The exclusion of the document from the collection of Milton's State Letters, left in MS. by himself, is easily accounted for. It was already in print. The document in any case not being a mere Letter, I leave it unnumbered.

(XXVIII.) To the Grand Duke of Tuscany, *July* 29, 1652:—This Letter was from the Council of State, and was signed by the President for the month, i.e. Mr. Bond. The Council had heard from Mr. Charles Longland, English agent at Leghorn, of a signal service done by the Grand Duke to the Commonwealth. Four Dutch men-of-war had come into Leghorn harbour, and threatened to sink or burn all the English shipping there; but the Grand Duke had ordered the Governor to protect the English ships at all hazards. For this fine act the Council thank him heartily, sending him at the same time a copy of the Declaration against the Dutch.

(XXIX.) To the Spanish Ambassador, *August*, 1652[1]:—This, I believe, is the paper read in Council on the 10th of August and ordered to be translated into Latin and conveyed to the Spanish Ambassador by Sir Oliver Fleming (ante p. 447). It had been the policy of Spain hitherto, as we have already seen, to avoid any very definite treaty. Cardenas, however, had recently given in some papers, and especially one in May, suggesting that there might be a renewal, with well considered amendments, of a League between Spain and England made in 1630. As he had complained of delay in the answer, the Council now explain at some length that they had all along desired a clear treaty with Spain, but that he himself had always put off definite proposals, and that even now his proposal was too vague. Let him, out of the old Leagues between Spain and England, or in any other way, frame a new one to be offered, and it will be at once considered. Meanwhile nothing of his, really requiring answer, but has already been answered by the Council, whereas there is still in his hands unanswered an old letter of the

---

[1] Quite undated in Printed Collection and in Phillips: not in the Skinner Transcript at all.

Council's. The subject of that letter is not mentioned; but I infer that it was the murder of Ascham.

(XXX.) To the Grand Duke of Tuscany, *Sept.* 2, 1652[1]:—Another letter of thanks for the Duke's generous protection of the English ships at Leghorn, of which more detailed news has been received. The Commonwealth will not forget that act of his Excellency, and meanwhile all English ships of war going into Tuscan ports have been ordered not to fail in due honours of salute by firing of guns, &c. ("*ut salutationes explosione tormentorum consuetas, omnemque honorem debitum vestræ Celsitudini, exhibere meminerint*"). The Letter was from the Council, and was signed by the President of the month, i.e. Colonel Purefoy.

(XXXI.) To the Danish Ambassadors Extraordinary, *Oct.* 1652[2]:—I identify this as a Paper mentioned in the Council Order Books under date Oct. 1, as then approved of and ordered to be translated into Latin and sent to the Danish Ambassadors by the Council's Committee. It is a discussion of certain clauses of the Commercial Treaty then proposed between England and Denmark.

(XXXII.) To the same, *Oct.* 1652[3]:—From the Commons Journals of Oct. 22, and the Council Order Book for the same day, it appears that the Danish Ambassadors had returned a very unsatisfactory reply on certain clauses of the Treaty, that the Council had prepared an answer, and that Parliament had approved of the same and returned it to the Council for translation into Latin and delivery to the Ambassadors. This, I think, is the answer so translated. It regrets that the Ambassadors have not the full powers the Council thought they had, and insists on the Articles they hesitated about; nay, adds one essential Article more, viz. that the Commonwealth, in trading with his Danish Majesty's territories, shall be on the same footing as the Dutch or any other the most favoured nation. This, as we know, broke off the Treaty, and a week afterwards the Ambassadors were gone (ante p. 378).

(XXXIII.) To the King of Denmark, *Nov.* 6, 1652:—This Letter is from the Parliament, and signed by the Speaker. Information has been received that his Danish Majesty, angry at the failure of the Treaty, or now inclining to the Dutch side, will not allow the English ships in Copenhagen to leave the port, and that the Admiral of the fleet sent for their convoy home can obtain no satisfaction. This is a serious state of affairs; and, to prevent in time any greater mischief, likely perhaps to follow ("*ut . . . sequuturo fortasse majori cuipiam incommodo maturius occurratur*"), the Parliament have sent Richard Bradshaw, Esq., hitherto their resident at Hamburg, to try to arrange the affair. They beg a favourable reception for him.

---

[1] No. 20 in Skinner Transcript (where the exact date is given); dated by the month only in Printed Collection and in Phillips.

[2] Quite undated in Printed Collection and in Phillips: not in Skinner Transcript at all.

[3] Ditto.

(XXXIV.) To the Grand Duke of Tuscany, *Nov.* 9, 1652[1]:—Letters have been received from the Grand Duke, of date Aug. 17, complaining of the seizure of a certain ship, with a cargo of rice, belonging to Captain Cardi of Leghorn. The Admiralty Judges in London have had the case before them, and have decided against Captain Cardi; but a process of appeal is still open to him. In dealing, however, with a subject of so good a friend as the Grand Duke, the Parliament will not stand upon mere law. Purely in testimony of their regard for the Duke, they have ordered the restitution of the ship and cargo, or the full value of the same; and Captain Cardi's representative in London is already satisfied. This letter is signed by the Speaker.

(XXXV.) To the Spanish Ambassador, *Nov.* 11, 1652[2]:—A Letter from the Council, signed by Sir William Masham as President for the month, in reply to one just received from the Ambassador. Two Spanish ships have been seized by an English man-of-war as carrying contraband of war, and the Ambassador has complained. He is informed that his version of the facts is not correct, but that the Court of Admiralty will consider the matter carefully, and see justice done.

(XXXVI.) To the same, *same day*:—A far more cordial letter from the Council, also signed by Masham. The Council have recently been informed that, when the English Admiral Baddeley, with four ships of war, put into Porto Longo (*Porto Longone*, in the Island of Elba?) to refit, after a two days' fight with eleven Dutch ships, the governor of that town was most courteous and attentive. Now, as the place is in his Spanish Majesty's dominions, the Council cannot but see in the fact the good fruits of the present relations between Spain and the Commonwealth, and a promise of still closer alliance.

(XXXVII.) To the Grand Duke of Tuscany, *Dec.* 14, 1652:—From the Parliament, and signed by the Speaker. The Parliament cannot sufficiently express their regret that, after their repeated orders to all their naval officers to show especial respect to the Grand Duke, one of those officers, Captain Appleton, should have behaved with such insolence in the port of Leghorn. They have just received the Duke's letter on the subject, and also heard particulars from his worthy Resident, Salvetti. They have recalled Captain Appleton to be put on his trial; and his punishment, if he is found guilty, shall be severe. They will further see that there shall be no such conduct by any English officer in future, and that all shall understand that even the Hollanders are not to be attacked within sight of the Lanthorn of Leghorn.—Though the letter is dated Dec. 14 in Milton's own collection, I find, from the Minute Books of the Committee of Council for Foreign Affairs (kept in the

---

[1] Date from Skinner Transcrpit: Printed Collection gives the month only.

[2] Not in the Skinner Transcript.

Record office, and distinct from the Order Books of the Council itself) that the letter was ordered Jan. 7, 1652–3.

(XXXVIII.) To the Doge of Venice, *Dec.* 29, 1652[1]:—A brief acknowledgment by the Speaker, for the Parliament, of letters received from the Doge and Senate through Lorenzo Paluzzi, and a reciprocation of the friendly feeling.

(XXXIX.) To the Spanish Ambassador, *Jan.* 1652–3[2]:—A letter from the Council of State, by order of Parliament, complaining that English subjects have recently been attending mass in his house and in the houses of other foreign ministers, and begging his Excellency to be more careful in future in that matter. His own rights and privileges of worship will be duly preserved. This, I believe, is only the copy for Cardenas of a circular letter on the subject to various ministers, ordered by Parliament Jan. 5, and which the Council instructed Thurloe to prepare Jan. 12 (Order Book for that date). Milton must have turned Thurloe's draft into Latin, or Thurloe must have devolved the thing itself on Milton.

(XL.) To the Doge and Senate of Venice, *Feb.* 1652–3[3]:—A letter from the Council of State, requesting the good offices of the Doge and Senate on behalf of two English merchants, John Dickens and Job Throgmorton. There has been a dispute since Nov. 1651 between them and a Venetian subject named Giovanni Piatti, as to property in a hundred butts of caviare; and Piatti, abetted by a Dutchman, David Rutts, has been putting them to a vast deal of trouble by detaining their goods, &c. The request is that Piatti and Rutts may be stopped in their proceedings, and made to abide the issue of a fair trial in the English Court of Admiralty.—The letter, I find, was ordered by the Council on the 2nd of Feb. to be translated into Latin, and sent to the Doge through the Venetian Secretary, Paluzzi (Council Order Book of date).

Here, on the evidence transmitted by Milton himself, was a considerably larger mass of diplomatic documentary work done by him for the Commonwealth in the seventeen months between Dec. 1651 and April 1653 than had been done by him in the whole previous two years and nine months of his Secretaryship. Yet his blindness had come on in these seventeen months, and had been total through the last ten or twelve of them, when, as the inventory shows, the work had been heaviest. Ill or well, at the office or away from the office, Milton, with allowance perhaps for a break-down for a day or two now and then when he was at his worst, had performed hitherto all the official paper-work required of him. Nor is the amount of *that* completely represented in the inventory; for we have heard otherwise, through the Council Minutes, of translations done by him of which there is no trace in the inventory—e. g. translations of Papers for the Council during their negotiations with the Spanish Ambassador, and with the new Portuguese Ambassador, in the latter part of 1652. Little wonder, then, that Milton could assure Bradshaw, early in 1653, that he believed himself still quite capable of all the essential business of his Secretaryship.

---

[1] Exact date from the Skinner Transcript; only the month given in Printed Collection.

[2] No. 119 (much out of its place) in Skinner Transcript. Quite undated there and in Printed Collection too: date ascertained from the subject.

[3] Much out of place in Printed Collection and in Phillips: not in Skinner Transcript at all.

Not of the *essential* business only. By a curious chance, there have come down to us two letters of this date, addressed to Milton, in part personally, in part in his official capacity, which prove him to have been still a very busy and influential man about the Council in the months immediately preceding Cromwell's *coup d'état,* and indeed exhibit him as then concerned in matters for the Council which we should have thought quite out of his province. We must first introduce, or rather reintroduce, the writer of the letters.

One of the Fellows of Christ's College, Cambridge, when Milton was there, had been an Andrew Sandelands.[1] He vacated the fellowship in 1630, when Milton was a B.A. of two years' standing; and it was to the fellowship so made vacant that young Edward King, the hero of *Lycidas*, was appointed by Royal warrant, when Milton himself, both by seniority in the College and by reputation, might have had the superior claim.[2] We never expected to meet this Andrew Sandelands again; but now, after more than twenty-two years, he turns up. By birth a Scotchman, though of Cambridge training, he had left his fellowship in Christ's, it would seem, for an English rectory or vicarage in Yorkshire. In the recent troubles, at all events, his principles being Royalist and anti-Puritan, he had been sequestrated from a living in that county, and so, at the age of over fifty, as we guess, and with a wife and children, had been driven to his shifts.[1] We have a glimpse of him in connexion with the Marquis of Montrose in the autumn of 1645, when that hero, by his year of splendid marches and victories in Scotland, had all but re-subjugated the whole country for Charles I., and Charles was sending him thanks and congratulations from Oxford, and even meditating his own march out of England, then unsafe for him by the disaster of Naseby, that he might club his future fortunes with those of his conquering general in the north. In the September of that year, we are told, when Montrose was at his Leaguer at Bothwell, holding triumphant court in the King's name, and making preparations for the Scottish Parliament he had summoned to declare and complete the overthrow of the Argyle Government (Vol. III. pp. 361–363), there arrived at Bothwell, by different routes from Oxford, two messengers from the King. One was that President Sir Robert Spotswood who brought Montrose his new commission as Viceroy and Captain-General in Scotland; the other is described simply as "Andrew Sandelands, who had been educated in England, and was in holy orders[2]." After Montrose's sudden ruin at Philiphaugh, poor Spotswood had suffered capitally for *his* mission; but Sandelands had escaped and lived on, still seemingly in some connexion or correspondence with Montrose, whether while Montrose continued to skulk in the Scottish Highlands, or afterwards in his exile. Whatever the connexion was, it was at an end in May 1650, when Montrose, captured after his fatal return to Scotland on behalf of Charles II., died on the scaffold in Edinburgh. Then had come Cromwell's conquests in Scotland, and the extinction of all the chances and hopes of Royalism, both in Scotland and in England, by the Battle of Worcester; and Sandelands was one of the thousands who had to reconcile themselves as well as they could to the established Commonwealth, and scheme for dear life over again by a behaviour to suit. As with others in like predicament, his object seems now to have been to ingratiate himself with the Commonwealth authorities by doing them some service; and he seems to have thought it best to approach them through his old friend Mr. Secretary Milton, and to have found Milton kindly, and willing to do all he could, if only in remembrance of their bygone days together in Christ's.[1] Farther, it would appear that the particular service for the Commonwealth proposed by Sandelands had reference to Scotland. The great business of the Incorporation of Scotland with the Commonwealth had been one of the chief interests of the year 1652; and, since the return of most of the English Commissioners in the beginning of the year, after having proposed the Tender of Union to the Scots, and settled the main question, the four English judges, with many inferior English agents, had been residing in Scotland, assisting Generals Monk and Dean in their inquiries as to the condition and revenues of the country, the reforms there necessary, and the ways in which Scotland might be made to contribute to the needs of the Commonwealth. The notion of Mr. Sandelands seems to have been that, being a Scotchman himself, knowing the country and the people, and having connexions and relationships there, he might be of special use in this survey of Scotland for the English Council. In particular, he had an idea that the woods of Scotland might be turned to immense account for the supply of the English navy, at a cheap rate, with timber, tar, and other requisites, now in such demand by reason of the naval war with the Dutch. The idea had actually been communicated to the Council of State, perhaps through Milton; there had been some consultation about it among those taking charge of navy affairs, of whom Vane was always a principal; and the conclusion had been that farther information would be desirable. Accordingly, late in the year, Sandelands had gone to Scotland, whether with something like a commission from the Council, or only on speculation and with an understanding that he was to communicate with the Council through Milton. When he arrived in Scotland, it would seem, Monk and Dean had been recalled south for their naval services with Blake against the Dutch, leaving Overton and Lilburne in command (Nov. 1652); but Sandelands had had an interview with Dean just as he was going.

---

[1] Vol. I. p. 100.

[2] Vol. I. pp. 205—206.

---

[1] A subsequent Letter of his own in Thurloe, II. 226. In Walker's *Sufferings of the Clergy* (Part II. p. 373) there is a vague note of a "—— Sandelin, D.D., or LL.D.," as having been parson of either Buttercomb or Housham in Yorkshire.

[2] Napier's Montrose, p. 565.

---

[1] I conjectured long ago that the particular Fellow of Christ's who was respondent in the Philosophical Act in the Cambridge commencement of 1628, and whom Milton obliged by furnishing him with the Latin Verses, "*Naturam non pati Senium*," required for the occasion, may have been Sandelands (Vol. I. 164—172.)

The letters from Sandelands to Milton will now pretty well explain themselves. The first is in answer to one Milton had sent to him in Scotland—a fact showing some real interest in the whole affair on Milton's part.

"Edinburgh, 15th Januarii, 1652" [i.e. 1652-3, for Sandelands, though in Scotland, keeps to English dating].

"Sir,

I received yours dated the 3rd of January; for which I do return you hearty thanks.[1]

Major-General Dean, when I took my leave of him, desired me to make my application, in his absence, to Major-General Overton and Colonel Lilburne. But such was my misfortune that, Major-General Overton, within a day or two, being necessitated to remove to the West of Scotland, I could not have an opportunity to express myself concerning the Scots woods so freely as I intended. And, despairing of his return, I resolved to have my recourse to Colonel Lilburne, whom I found a very great favourer both of myself and my design. And, because words sometimes vanishes into air, I resolved to express myself to him in writing; which I did January 14th [i.e. yesterday], as appears by these enclosed."

Accordingly, Sandelands encloses to Milton "*A True Copy of a Letter sent by A. S. to the Honourable Robert Lilburne, Commander-in-Chief of the forces in Scotland.*" It is long and detailed; but the substance is as follows:—"The wood of Glenmoriston, which "lies within five or six miles of Loch Ness, I find to be most "useful for masts and deal-board. The woods that lie on the "river Dee, belonging to the Marquis of Huntley and the Earl of "Mar, will afford you both timber and tar.—[But] the best and "most useful in all Scotland for tar is the wood of Abernethy [on "the upper Spey], being a red fir and full of sap. If the State "please to set a 100 or 200 men a-work this next March, to fell

---

[1] It is just possible that Sandelands had already been in Scotland, and that he had first communicated his exact idea to Milton and the Council thence in a previous letter, to which Milton's of the 3rd of January 1652—3 was a reply.

" and cut down some part of it, they may this summer burn as " much of the wood as may furnish their Navy with tar one year; " and, if the next year they will be pleased to set men a-work to " fell the wood from Christmas 1653 to the last of March following, " they may make as much tar the summer after as may furnish " these nations for divers years. Besides, the best of the timber, " being saved, will not only defray all charges, but likewise yield a " considerable sum of money for the payment of the garrisons in " the Highlands and the North of Scotland. The charcoal of the " burnt wood will pay the men their wages that attend the tar-" works. The tar may be carried in waggons and carts to the " mouth of Spey, if a small charge be bestowed in mending one or " two places in the way. After a great rain you may send the " timber in floats down the river, appointing two or three men to " attend them on each side of the river, that, if at any time they lay " hold on the bushes, they may be put off the land into the middle " of the stream. At the mouth of the Spey two or three boats, " taking advantage of the tide, may stop the float from going into " the sea, and bring it safe to the wharf or timber-yard which is " to be built on the Laird of Grant's charge, as appears by the " lease granted by him [to] Captain Masson. This will also be a " very convenient place for building of your saw-mills, there being " good accommodation for the workmen and safety from the violence " of any enemy. The tar works will require twenty or thirty men." —Sandelands farther informs Lilburne that he had been diligently enquiring whether workmen of the kinds needed could be found in Scotland. Only in Berwick could he find any, and but two or three there; but Mr. Dun of that town could bring workmen in sufficient numbers from Norway before the 1st of April, or a letter from the Swedish agent in London could bring them from Sweden by the 1st of May.—He concludes, " Sir, if it shall please the State " to employ Mr. Gordon the younger, of Straloch (whose abilities " are well known to you), he and I will, in a few months, view all " the woods in Scotland that are within the State's quarters, and " divide them in such proportions as you may know how much may " be cut yearly, and what may be expected from the several woods." —Lilburne must have answered Sandelands promptly; for his answer went to Milton with the copy of the letter which had evoked it. He recommended Sandelands to undertake the Abernethy wood-felling and tar-producing business as a speculation of his own, alone or in partnership with somebody, and reap the profits.

" Sir, you may perceive, by his letter that he urges me to an impossibility, either to undertake the work myself or to procure one [to do so]. My Lord Tullibardine, who hath a third part of that wood, refuses, giving this reason,—because no private man in these times is able to carry on the work, not having power to command neither the soldiery nor the country to afford them that assistance which is requisite. The truth is, no Scotsman will undertake it, because it is reputed a disservice to the King and country [no wonder, when it was a stripping of the country of its fine woods, to make tar for the English !]. The best way to me would seem to be this : to engage either your East Country or Norway merchants, your timber-masters, or else such citizens in London as deals in pitch and tar. By this means you shall make a sure bargain, though not so profitable; for, if the State will set men a-work themselves, they may make for every hundred pound a thousand.

"If it please you but to consider the scope of my letter, you shall find that I do demonstrate unto Colonel Lilburne that the State, undertaking the work themselves, may have abundance of tar for nothing, and timber which will not only defray all charges, but pay your garrisons in the Highlands and North of Scotland.

"Now, Sir, for my further encouragement, give me leave to renew my humble petition to you that you would procure to me the gift of that weather-beaten skull of my noble and truly honourable patron, and that it remain no longer a contemptuous object and *ludibrium Presbyterorum Scotorum,* who are the basest of men.—I have no news, but that we are here in peace, and seem very inclinable to peace. Only, Jack Presbyter (who is still a sworn enemy to Civil Government), Jan. the 1st, refused the magistrates of Edinburgh to have a voice in the election of that sacred beast 'The Ruling Elder,' because, forsooth, they [the magistrates] have taken the Engagement and submitted to the Commonwealth of England : forgetting that they [the Presbyterian Clergy] had established a Scots Commonwealth these eight years.—Thus I remain

"Your faithful Servant,
"AND. SANDELANDS."

[Endorsed]
"For his much honoured Friend,
John Milton, Esquire,
At his house in Petite France, Westminster,
beyond London, *These.*"

There is no end to the surprises that may turn up from old documents recovered by accident or research. One might have thought it a sufficient surprise from this letter to find Milton, in the last year of the Commonwealth, compelled to interest himself in such a subject as the supply of timber and tar for the English from the fir-woods of Scotland, and brought into acquaintance with such minutiæ of the subject as the superiority of the word of Abernethy for tar, and the mode of floating the fir-trunks from that wood down the Spey, and the probable convenience for that purpose of the projected shanty or timber-yard of "Captain Masson" at Speymouth,

—and all this through information from an unfortunate old friend whom he remembered as one of the fellows of Christ's College long ago, and to whose fellowship young Edward King of *Lycidas* had succeeded when he might have looked for that academic promotion himself. But in the last paragraph of the letter there is a surprise within a surprise. Who would have expected to find Milton the man implored by a Scottish Royalist to obtain for him the head of the Marquis of Montrose, after it had been exposed for nearly three years on a spike over the Tolbooth of Edinburgh? Yet such was the fact. The "weather-beaten skull of my noble and truly honourable patron," applied for by Sandelands so touchingly, and not for the first time either, can have been no other than that of the great Scottish chief to whose retinue he had been attached, as we have seen, before Philiphaugh. He had doubtless been looking wistfully again at the grinning relic, on its spike in the High Street of Edinburgh, on the very day when he wrote his letter to Milton; and he was moved to repeat in that letter the request he had made to Milton already. Either Milton did not concern himself in the matter, or he was unsuccessful; for the skull of Montrose remained on the spike over the Edinburgh Tolbooth till January 1661, when it and the other scattered remains of his corpse were gathered together reverentially, for burial with all post-Restoration honours.

No answer having come to the foregoing letter for two months and a half, Sandelands grew impatient in Edinburgh, and addressed another letter to Milton, as follows:—

"Edinburgh, 29th March, 1653.

"Sir,—

If the loss of time and expense of money could dishearten me to do the State's service, I had before this time returned to my wife and children. But, to evidence my real affection to you, and my willingness to do the State's service, I have patiently attended their commands, and have neglected no opportunity to do them service, as appears by my former letters.

"Sir, That great Polititian [*sic*] the Marquis of Argyle hath sold the Commonwealth of England his cannon, knowing very well how to supply his Castle with cannons again: having four and forty piece of brazen cannon at his command, lying upon the coast of

Kintyre, buried within the sea-mark, and recoverable in eight-and-forty hours' time.

"Sir, I pray let me know particularly what I may expect, for I have not credit to subsist one week longer here.—And I am, Sir,

[Endorsed] "Your most humble Servant,
"For his much honoured Friend, "AND. SANDELANDS."
John Milton, Esquire, *These*."

All this was, surely, not in Milton's department. But, the letters being on matters of public consequence, he had duly taken them to the Council, who had referred them to the Admiralty and Navy Committee, so that to this day they lie in our Public Record Office, the second of the two bearing this official endorsement at the time, as if to call special attention to one item in it, "*Edinbr.* 29° *Martii* 1653 : *And. Sandelands to Mr. Milton, touching ye E. of Argile's cannons.*"[1] Nothing was done, either by the Navy Committee or by the Council, in the scheme which Mr. Sandelands had at heart; for within three weeks after the receipt of the second letter the Rump and the Council had ceased to exist and Cromwell was Dictator. Whether the woods of Scotland should be turned into timber and tar or not depended thenceforth, as all things else did, on *him*. Taking the incidental evidence furnished by the Sandelands correspondence, however, with all the other proofs recently given of Milton's unabated, or recovered, fitness for work, after his first year of blindness, might not Cromwell do worse than continue Mr. Milton in his Secretaryship?

---

[1] They were found quite recently, in "a bundle of unsorted Navy Papers," by Mrs. Everett Green, in the process of her admirable labour of calendaring the Domestic State Papers of the Commonwealth, and were at once, very generously and obligingly, communicated to me by that lady.

BOOK III.

APRIL 1653—SEPTEMBER 1654.

HISTORY:—CROMWELL'S INTERIM DICTATORSHIP AND ELEVATION TO THE PROTECTORATE.

I. THE INTERIM DICTATORSHIP, WITH THE BAREBONES PARLIAMENT: APRIL 1653—DEC. 1653.

II. FIRST NINE MONTHS OF OLIVER'S FIRST PROTECTORATE: DEC. 1653—SEPT. 1654.

BIOGRAPHY:—MILTON'S LIFE AND SECRETARYSHIP THROUGH THIS PERIOD.

CHAPTER I.

CROMWELL'S INTERIM DICTATORSHIP AND THE BAREBONES PARLIAMENT: APRIL 20—DEC. 16, 1653.

GENERAL ADHESION TO CROMWELL AFTER HIS DISSOLUTION OF THE RUMP: HIS INTERIM COUNCIL OF THIRTEEN AND ITS PROCEEDINGS: HIS SUMMONS OF A SUPREME CONVENTION OR ASSEMBLY OF NOTABLES FOR ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND: ANOTHER VICTORY OVER THE DUTCH: REAPPEARANCE OF JOHN LILBURNE: MEETING OF THE SUPREME ASSEMBLY, JULY 4: IT TAKES FORM AS THE LITTLE OR BAREBONES PARLIAMENT: NEW COUNCIL OF STATE: HIGH PROMISE OF THE BAREBONES PARLIAMENT: YET ANOTHER VICTORY OVER THE DUTCH: THE LAST OF LILBURNE IN PUBLIC: COMMOTIONS IN SCOTLAND: DISPERSION OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY IN EDINBURGH, AND PROHIBITION OF FUTURE ASSEMBLIES: ACTS OF THE BAREBONES PARLIAMENT AS FAR AS NOV. 1653: APPOINTMENT OF A NEW COUNCIL OF STATE IN THAT MONTH: WHITLOCKE'S EMBASSY TO SWEDEN: A RADICAL PARTY AND A CONSERVATIVE PARTY EVEN IN THE BAREBONES PARLIAMENT: THE REAL QUESTION THAT OF TITHES AND AN ESTABLISHED CHURCH: EQUAL BALANCE OF THE PARTIES IN THIS QUESTION: VOTE OF DEC. 10 AND DEAD-LOCK IN CONSEQUENCE: CROMWELL IN SYMPATHY WITH THE CONSERVATIVES: BREAK-UP OF THE PARLIAMENT BY SPEAKER ROUS AND RESURRENDER OF ITS TRUST TO CROMWELL: ESTABLISHMENT OF THE PROTECTORATE.

"This morning," says *The Weekly Intelligencer of the Commonwealth*, under date Thursday, April 21, 1653, "the discourse of what passed the day before was the subject of "every tongue both in London and in Westminster, and "hardly any man in either of the cities appeared to be sorry "for it." The statement seems to be substantially true. A Declaration put forth by Cromwell and his Council of Officers on the 22nd of April, explaining the reasons for the Dissolution of the Parliament, and desiring all judges, sheriffs, justices of the peace, mayors, and other civil authorities of whatever kinds, to remain at their posts, had universal effect. A Second Declaration, which followed immediately, was little more than a repetition of the first. People waited quietly to know what new Constitution for the Commonwealth would emerge from the deliberations of Cromwell and the officers about him.[1]

That was indicated generally in a Third Declaration, issued on the 30th of April in the name of Lord General Cromwell only. It announced briefly that the Supreme Authority was to be placed in the hands of exactly such an Assembly of carefully chosen persons as had been suggested to the late Parliament in lieu of the promiscuous New Representative they were bent on, and that, till this Assembly should meet, the management of affairs would be vested in a small Council of State. The core of this Council of State (Cromwell, Lambert, Harrison, and five others) had, in fact, constituted itself in Whitehall on the preceding day; and, when the Council was complete, it included nine officers and four civilians, as follows:[2]—

The Lord General Cromwell.

Major-General Lambert.
Major-General Harrison.
Major-General Desborough.

Colonel Matthew Tomlinson.
Colonel Robert Bennett.
Colonel Philip Jones.

---

[1] *Weekly Intelligencer* as quoted; Parl. Hist. III. 1386—1390; Godwin, III. 519—520.

[2] It does not seem to have been thought worth while formally to publish the names of this temporary and self-constituted body; but I gather them from the minutes of their meetings from April 29 onwards (Council Order Books in Record Office). The only new name to us is that put last. Mr. Samuel Moyer had not been in Parliament, but was a citizen who had held some official appointment in the Customs (Mrs. Green's Calendar of State Papers, under date Dec. 24, 1649). Doubtless, Cromwell knew him well.

Colonel Anthony Stapley.
Colonel William Sydenham.
Sir Gilbert Pickering, Bart.
Mr. Walter Strickland.
Mr. John Carew.
Mr. Samuel Moyer.

By this Council of Thirteen, at the side of which was still the Council of Officers that had called it into being, all necessary business was transacted from April 29 to July 4. The minutes of their meetings during those nine weeks are still extant, and give a rough idea of what went on. Cromwell was generally present; but Lambert, Sir Gilbert Pickering, Harrison, and others, were successively in the Chair, with the power of signing all letters and warrants; and Thurloe, who was retained as Secretary, with Mr. Gualter Frost for his Assistant, had to attach his signature also to such letters and warrants, certifying that they were to order. For such of the Thirteen as had not already quarters in Whitehall accommodation was found there; Thurloe and Frost were kept in their rooms there or obtained others; and for special business from day to day the Council resolved itself into small Standing Committees. In this way there was no interruption to the thread of affairs as it had been transmitted from the former Council, the rather as there had poured in such ample adhesions to the Lord General in his late bold act as might well put him and the Council somewhat at ease. There had been an immediate adhesion by the Fleet, signed by Dean, Monk, and the Captains of ships,—Blake absent at the time from illness, but believed to acquiesce; there had been a "hearty concurrence" from the officers of the Army in Scotland, signed at Dalkeith on the 5th of May; there had been a submission from the authorities in Ireland; there had been addresses of fervid admiration and attachment to Cromwell himself from counties, congregations, and bodies of ministers; the London press was eminently favourable; there was but one growl of openly expressed dissatisfaction, and that only from "several Aldermen, &c." of the City of London. Not over-estimating the value of all this, nor unaware of the quantity of dumb dissent or worse that might be lying on spring throughout the community, the Thirteen could yet proceed meanwhile as a sufficiently accredited Government. Nor did they shrink from any part of the responsibility. There were communications with the Fleet, and the Dutch war was pushed on; the Treaty that had been in progress with the Portuguese Ambassador was resumed in Committee; the negotiation with the French Resident M. de Bordeaux was prosecuted as before; other foreign Residents had the audiences they required. And so in matters of domestic concern. Four Welsh judges were removed or suspended, and two new ones appointed in their room; orders went to Scotland and Ireland; the few "Aldermen, &c." who had ventured on the solitary petition for the restoration of the Rump were discharged from their places; one or two printers of dangerous pamphlets were arrested; there was even time for an order for suppressing "the bear-baiting and bull-baiting heretofore used in Southwark," and for other orders relating to public morals.[1]

Two most important matters, however, the Council of Thirteen did regard as not belonging to them. One was the prospective provision for the Army and Navy after the Act of the late Parliament levying an assessment of £120,000 per month for the purpose should expire. As it was to expire on the 24th of June, a decree for its continuance for six months beyond that term was immediately essential; but it was thought better that the decree should emanate not from the Council of Thirteen, but from the more fundamental power on which that Council itself and the whole new system of things really rested. It emanated, therefore, from the Council of Officers, i. e. from Cromwell, Lambert, Harrison, and the rest of the military chiefs as such. It was deemed proper also that the momentous business of selecting the persons that were to compose the promised Supreme Assembly should be in the hands of the Council of Officers, or indeed of Cromwell himself. He was by his own act the one all-responsible interim Trustee of the Commonwealth, his officers only standing round him with their approval after the act, and the Council of Thirteen being but his and their executive for present routine. On him, therefore, it devolved to create and shape to his own mind the new Supreme Body to which he had resolved to resign the trust. Through the whole of May there was the most anxious consideration of this subject between him and his officers, with consultations of those Puritan ministers for whose opinions Cromwell had most respect; and at length, the size of the new Supreme Body having been determined on, and the persons for it chosen after the strictest scrutiny of their fitness individually, and especially of their moral and religious fitness, there went forth over the British Islands, on the 6th of June, 139 summonses or writs in this form: "I, Oliver Cromwell, Captain General "and Commander-in-Chief of all the Armies and Forces "raised or to be raised within this Commonwealth, do hereby "summon and require *you*," &c. Each of the 139 persons so addressed was required to attend at the Council Chamber in Whitehall on the 4th of July next, there to meet with the others and enter on his trust. Nor were the 139 summoned simply as so many individuals. They were distinctly summoned as representatives—115 of them to represent the forty COUNTIES OF ENGLAND (in proportions varying from one to eight for each county according to its size); seven to represent the CITY OF LONDON; and six to represent WALES as a whole, five SCOTLAND as a whole, and six IRELAND as a whole. The Assembly, in fact, was to be a representative body *for* Constituencies, not elected by the Constituencies themselves, but by Cromwell and his advisers as judges of the kind of men that would be fittest. The list did not include Cromwell himself, nor Lambert, Harrison, Desborough, or Tomlinson; but it included the other eight members of the Council of Thirteen—to wit, Bennett, Carew, Jones, Stapley, Sydenham, Pickering, Strickland, and Moyer. It included also Blake and Monk, and such men of acquired or future distinction as Francis Rous, Henry Lawrence, Viscount Lisle, Colonel Montague, Colonel Charles Howard, Sir Charles Wolseley, and Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper. Some of these had been members of the Rump, as had been a sprinkling of the others. Among the members for Ireland were Colonel Hewson and

---

[1] Council Order Books in Record Office (*Draft* Order Book from April 29 to May 5, succeeded by *Fair* for what remains of our present time); Thomason Pamphlets and News-Sheets for April, May, and June; Godwin, III. 466—7 and 525—8.

Colonel Henry Cromwell; and the five members for Scotland were Sir James Hope of Hopeton, Alexander Brodie, John Swinton of Swinton, William Lockhart of Lee, and Alexander Jaffray of Aberdeen.[1]

While Cromwell's summonses were out for the new Supreme Assembly of Notables, two matters that have not yet been mentioned engaged the Interim Council of Thirteen.—On the 2nd of June there had been another great sea-battle with the Dutch. Van Tromp, with a vast fleet, had fought for two days in the Channel with the English fleet under Monk and Dean, to whom Blake had attached himself with a reinforcement as the battle went on. The victory had been again for the English, with eight ships of the enemy destroyed, and eleven ships and many prisoners taken, but with the loss to themselves of the brave Admiral Dean, killed by a chain-shot. Amid the rejoicings in London, there had to be arrangements for the reception of Dean's body and its honourable burial in the Abbey; after which came a new embassy of peace from the Dutch, consisting of Mynheers Nieuport, Jongestall, Van de Perre, and Beverning. In conferences with these, beginning June 22, Cromwell and the rest of the Council were so firm and high in their demands that, though the Ambassadors remained for farther chances, the war went on.[2]—Moreover, John Lilburne had reappeared. Banished from England, under pain of death, by that extraordinary Act of the late Parliament, in January 1651–2, which had been devised to get rid of him for ever (ante p. 358), he had spent the intermediate sixteen months in Holland and Flanders, not in destitution by any means, but gnawing his heart most miserably. In a pamphlet printed at Amsterdam, both in English and Dutch, he had tried to keep his case alive, telling the very canals and quays how he had been treated in his native country, and what fiends and ruffians now domineered there. He had since then been in intercourse with the Duke of Buckingham, Colepepper, Hopton, Bramhall, and other

---

[1] Godwin, III. 523—528; Carlyle, II. 333—335; Parl. Hist. III. 1407—1409 (where there is the complete list).

[2] Council Order Books; Godwin, III. 544—5; Thurloe, I. 299 et seq.

Royalist refugees, and offering his services in any desperate conspiracy even for Charles II.; and he had been exulting in the difficulties brought on the Rump by the Dutch war. In a second pamphlet of his exile, dated from Bruges, he had spoken of "Van Tromp his late foiling of Cromwell's General "Blake: which action hath given Cromwell and his Knipper-"dolings and Councillors a clear demonstration that the "Dutch will not be brought to bow in his way." Expressions in the same pamphlet had been "Alchemy St. Oliver and his graceless tribe," "Cromwell's beastly and most abominable tyranny," "That grand tyrant Cromwell and his lawless bloodthirsty crew"—all directed against the Rump in general. He had told people confidentially in the pamphlet that he judged Cromwell "to be as false as the Devil himself," and that he would not trust his apparent friendliness even in a certain new matter of interest between them. For Lilburne's wife, like a sensible woman, instead of devoting herself, in London, as Lilburne wanted her to do, to the circulation of Lilburne's pamphlets, had been going to Cromwell and Hasilrig, and advising with them as to means for bringing her husband to his senses, or at least recovering and securing his English property. "I have engaged to her, "and will stand to it," Lilburne had written, "to sign and "seal anything, by way of further settling of it upon her "and her children, that she and my adversaries themselves "rationally will have me, providing in the managing of my "business she do it so as that it is like the action of the wife "of J. Lilburne;" but, should she deviate from that duty, then "I am confident it would take such a deep impression "upon my spirit that, notwithstanding my now entire affec-"tion to her, I should never own her again as the wife of "my bosom while I breathed, although I should force myself "thereby to live in a voluntary widowhood all my days—"which truly, in my present apprehensions of it, would be a "condition almost as unpleasant to me as to live under "Cromwell's bloody tyranny." How grievously John had here miscalculated! All this, written at Bruges, was in London in print on the 27th of March, 1653; on the 20th of

April Cromwell had dissolved the Rump; and on the 3rd of May Lilburne's wife was in Holland with him, reporting the glorious news. What a whirl then in John's ideas! The Rump Government dissolved, and the deed done by Cromwell, his old friend Cromwell, whom he had once called "the most absolute single-hearted great man in England," and who would now at all events be Dictator of England, unbound by anything that the Rump had done! Was not his banishment at an end? Would Cromwell treat it as valid? Might he not return? Why had he been in such haste with that last pamphlet, or used those horrible expressions in it? But Cromwell was generous; no one knew how generous Cromwell could be; he would try him! Accordingly, Lilburne had written to Cromwell, and had stood for some time on the Dutch quays,—waiting, waiting. No answer having come, he had ventured all and taken ship. On the 14th of June he was in a lodging in Moorfields, whence he sent another humble letter to Cromwell. What could be done with such a nuisance? The next day he was in custody in "Mr. Sheriff Underwood's house in Bucklersbury," writing another letter to Cromwell, humbler still; and on June 20 he was in Newgate, still writing. Cromwell had reported his arrival to the Council, and it was for the Council to inquire whether the tales about his conspiracies with the Royalists abroad were true, and whether therefore, on grounds of expediency, his defiance of the Act of banishment should not be referred to the law. Their decision was against him. "Free-born John is turned over to the Sessions at the Old Bailey, and I believe will speedily be hanged," says a letter of June 27. There was, however, still so much feeling in his favour and petitioning for him among the Londoners that his trial was postponed. The new Supreme Assembly was about to meet.[1]

On Monday the 4th of July the Assembly did meet in

---

[1] Lilburne's *Apologetical Narration* (dated "Amsterdam, April 1652," and printed in Dutch and English); his *Lieut.-Colonel John Lilburne Revived* (dated "Bruges" and printed March 1653); his *Banished Man's First Suit for Protection* (June 15, 1653); his *Second Address* (June 16), his *Third Address* (June 20), and his *Defensive Declaration* (June 20). Also *Weekly Intelligencer*, No. 124, and Thurloe, I. 320—324.

Whitehall, quite crowding the Council Chamber. Cromwell, "standing by the window opposite to the middle of the table," with a number of his Army officers about him, then made his great "First Speech" to the Assembly, and delivered to them a parchment, under his own hand and seal, by which he constituted them the Supreme Authority till Nov. 3, 1654, entitling them to sit till then, and to choose, three months before that term, their successors in another Assembly, to sit for twelve months more, and regulate the farther succession of the Government. He then left the room.[1]

Next day the Assembly began work by calling old Mr. Rous to the chair, appointing Mr. Henry Scobell to be clerk, sending a deputation to Cromwell to desire him to honour the House by becoming a member himself, and electing also Lambert, Harrison, Desborough, and Tomlinson to be members. This brought the whole of the Interim Council of State into the House, and raised the total number of the House to 144. The next few meetings were still occupied with preliminaries. On the question by what name the House should be called, it was decided, not without a division, that it should be called, PARLIAMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF ENGLAND; and, the mace having been brought from Colonel Wolseley's, where it had been lying since April 20, and the Serjeant-at-Arms to the old House having been reappointed, the Assembly did thenceforth adopt all the forms of a Parliament, Mr. Rous becoming "Mr. Speaker."—In History it was to be known as THE LITTLE PARLIAMENT, or, more jocosely, as THE BAREBONES PARLIAMENT, from the fact that a rather prominent member of it was a leather-merchant named *Barbone*, an important man among the London Baptists.—On Saturday, July 9, it was voted unanimously that all the members of the Interim Council of State, with Major Salway, who had been a kind of supernumerary in that Council, should be members of a regular new Council of State, which was to co-operate with the Parliament and be its executive till Nov. 3 next; and, seventeen more members having been nominated on July 14, the new Council was then complete, and consisted of thirty-one members, as follows:—

---

[1] Carlyle's Cromwell, II. 336—362; and Commons Journals, July 4, 1653.

The Lord General Cromwell.

Major-General Lambert.
Major-General Harrison.
Major-General Desborough.
Colonel Matthew Tomlinson.
Colonel Robert Bennett.
Colonel Philip Jones.
Colonel Anthony Stapley.
Colonel William Sydenham.
Sir Gilbert Pickering, Bart.
Mr. Walter Strickland.
Mr. John Carew.
Mr. Samuel Moyer.
Major Richard Salway.
Lord Viscount Lisle.
Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, Bart.
Sir Charles Wolseley, Bart.
Lieutenant-General Fleetwood.
Colonel John Hewson.
Colonel Henry Lawrence.
Colonel Richard Norton.
Sir James Hope.
Mr. Edward Montague.
Mr. Charles Howard.
Alderman Tichbourne.
Mr. Richard Major.
Mr. Hugh Courtney.
Mr. Thomas St. Nicholas.
Mr. Dennis Hollister.
Mr. Andrew Broughton.
Mr. John Williams.[1]

By this Council of State, in conjunction with the Parliament in Whitehall, affairs were conducted till Nov. 3, 1653, very much as they had been before by the old Councils in conjunction with the Rump in St. Stephen's. But the attendances of this Little Parliament were much more exemplary than those of the Rump. Of all the 144 members only *two* are said never to have presented themselves; and the records of divisions show constant Houses at the beginning of from 100 to 115, diminishing indeed at the end of July, and through August, September, and October, but only on one occasion falling so low as forty-two, and averaging rather between sixty and seventy, with eighty to ninety easy enough on occasion. The Parliament indeed addressed itself to its work in real earnest. There was resort, of course, to the usual machinery of Standing Committees. There were twelve such Committees in all: to wit, one for the affairs of Scotland, one for those of Ireland, one for Army affairs, one for Revenue, one for Trade, one for Law-Reform, one for Pauperism, one for Petitions, one for Prisons and Prisoners, one for Detection of Fraud and Bribery, one for the subject of Tithes or Provision for the Ministry of the Gospel, and one for the Advancement of Learning. The very titles of these Committees will suggest what is the fact: viz. that the House meant to take up and settle those great questions on which the Rump had been latterly engaged. In each Committee there were leading men who were supposed to understand its particular question. Of the whole House, where all had to be ultimately determined, old Mr. Rous, though appointed originally but for a month, continued to be Speaker to the last. In all matters there was constant intercourse, by reference and report, between the House and the Council of State, and foreign matters and matters of urgency or secrecy especially belonged to the Council.[1]

---

[1] Journals of the House for the days named.

While the Parliament was proceeding with its work of new legislation, there were three incidents of the outside world in which the House was obliged to take an interest with the rest of the public:—(1) *Another Victory over the Dutch.* This was won off the Dutch coast on the 31st of July after a three days' battle between Monk as chief commander of the English fleet, with Blake, Penn, and Lawson assisting him, and Van Tromp and De Witt commanding the Dutch fleet. It was a tremendous defeat for the Dutch, who lost on this occasion their brave Van Tromp. Chains of gold, worth £300 each, were voted by the Parliament for Monk and Blake, on the 8th of August, with chains of £100 each for Penn and Lawson, and rewards besides for the inferior officers. The Dutch, on their side, were in the utmost despondency; the war was allowed to flag while the negotiation for peace dragged on; and early in October both Monk and Blake were able to be in their places in the House, where they were received with honours, and thanked by the Speaker for their "great and faithful services."[2] (2) *Lilburne's Trial.* This came on at the Old Bailey on the 13th of July, before Chief Baron Wylde and other judges, and it was protracted to Aug. 20. The prisoner was again in his element, with all his old obstinacy and powers of speech fully recovered; and he had the most eminent counsel, including Maynard, Glynne, and Hale. Every ingenuity and objection of law in bar of the trial was urged and urged again by himself and his counsel, and the anomalous nature of the Act of the Rump by which he had been sentenced made the whole case very doubtful. When at length he did plead, winding up with a speech of great length in his most pathetic strain, and when the Jury acquitted him, the delight in London was boundless. He was still such a hero with the populace that they had been all but in insurrection during his trial, and had presented petitions for him to the House couched in language of which the House had to take sharp notice. After his acquittal, it became a serious question with the House and the Council what to do with him. The seditious papers he had dispersed during the trial might form a new charge, apart from the question of his conspiracies with Royalists abroad and even complicity with agents of Charles II. believed then to be in England. On the whole it was agreed to keep him shut up "for the peace of the nation." From this date, accordingly, we shall hardly hear of him more in public. From the Tower he was transferred in due time to Elizabeth Castle, Jersey.[1] (3) *Royalist Insurrection in Scotland.* Lilburne's brother, Colonel Robert Lilburne, though a stout and faithful servant of the Commonwealth, was hardly fit for that command-in-chief in Scotland in which he had been left by the recall of Monk and Dean for sea-service in the Channel. The Earls of Glencairn, Balcarras, and Atholl, Royalists in any case, and made desperate by the uncertainty of their estates and prospects in Scotland under that Incorporating Union the Act for which was still incomplete, had been for some time astir in the Highlands; Lord Lorne, the son and heir of Argyle, "being but coarsely used by his father," had joined them, with his relative Viscount Kenmure; from Kintyre to Skye there was commotion. The English soldiery about Ayr, with some help from Argyle himself and other

---

[1] Commons Journals and Council Order Books over the period named.

[2] Commons Journals of Aug. 8, Oct. 1, and Oct. 10.

---

[1] Godwin, III. 555—559; Thurloe, I. 435, 441, 451—3; Council Order Book, Aug. 27 (warrant, signed by Sir A. A. Cooper and four others of the Council, for committing Lilburne to the Tower after his acquittal); Commons Journals of various dates to Nov. 26, 1653.

Scots of those parts, did what they could; but Lilburne's reports to London were alarming. On the whole, however, there was little immediate danger. The insurgent chiefs were quarrelling among themselves for the precedency; and not even when Glencairn produced a Commission from Charles II., appointing him provisionally General-in-chief, did the rivalry cease. Lorne and Balcarras disowned Glencairn's leadership, and the insurrection only smouldered. It would be time to send Monk back to take charge of Scotland when some real general for the Stuarts arrived to direct or supersede Glencairn. Middleton was expected, bringing perhaps Charles himself.[1]

Connected with this Royalist commotion in the Highlands was an event of Scottish history heard of at the time in London, though not with such intense emotion as its importance in Scottish opinion might have justified. Most precious to the Scots, the very centre-jewel of the national Presbyterianism recovered for them in 1638, was the right of holding their annual General Assembly of the whole Kirk. The succession of such Assemblies had been unbroken since 1638. Even in 1652, after Scotland had been annexed to the English Commonwealth, Monk had allowed an Assembly to meet in Edinburgh as usual. On Wednesday the 20th of July, 1653, accordingly, another Assembly met in the same city, nothing doubting. Mr. David Dickson, as Moderator of the last Assembly, had expounded *Galatians* Chap. II. in the morning, and also preached from 2 *Cor.* XIII. 11 in the afternoon, and Mr. Robert Douglas had preached from 1 *Cor.* XII. 25—27—both being very earnest for "healing the rent" in the Kirk between the Resolutioners and the Protesters—and the Assembly had just been formally constituted for the election of a new Moderator and further business, when in came "Lieutenant-Colonel Cotterel, and Captain Clifton, "Captain of the Castle of Edinburgh, and another Captain "with them, whose name I know not." The Colonel asked Mr. Dickson, who was still in the chair, whether the Assembly was sitting by any authority from the Parliament of the Commonwealth, or from the Commander-in-Chief in Scotland, or from the English Civil Commissioners. Mr. Dickson replied that no such authority was needed, for the Assembly was sitting, on the contrary, by the authority of the Lord Jesus Christ. Colonel Cotterel would not discuss that, but said he had orders to dissolve the Assembly, and that all present must therefore at once follow him out of the place, or he would have to bring in his soldiers to drag them out. "When we had entered a Protestation of this unheard-"of and unexampled violence, we did rise and follow him. "He led us all through the whole streets a mile out of the "town, encompassing us with foot-companies of musketeers "and horsemen without; all the people gazing and mourning "as at the saddest spectacle they had ever seen. When he "had led us a mile without the town, he then declared what "further he had in commission: that we should not dare to "meet any more above three in number, and that against "eight o'clock to-morrow we should depart the town, under "pain of being guilty of breaking the public peace. And, "the day following, by sound of trumpet, we were commanded "off town under the pain of present imprisonment. Thus our "General Assembly, the glory and strength of our Church "upon earth, is, by your soldiery, crushed and trod under foot." So writes Baillie, a week after the event, to his friend Mr. Calamy in London; and another of the sufferers calls it "the saddest day that ever I saw on earth," and adds, "God "is just, and will not forget a broken Covenant." What is certain is that from that day forward for a long lapse of years Scotland had no more General Assemblies of the Kirk, and had to be content, while she retained her Kirk at all, to manage it by the smaller meetings called Synods and Presbyteries.[1]

---

[1] Life of Robert Blair, 306—307; Baillie, III. 250—251.

By November 1653 the Barebones Parliament could exhibit a good deal of work actually done or in fair progress. There had been various regulations about Scotland; the Bill for incorporating Scotland had advanced somewhat; and there had been several acts for England remedying abuses in legal practice, one for relaxing imprisonment for debt, and one for bringing the revenues into a single Treasury. A new Marriage Act had been passed, requiring all English marriages to be solemnized in future by justices of the peace only, after due publication of banns in church or in the market place on market days. But these and other Acts positively passed were nothing to the Resolutions come to and in course of being turned into Acts. On the 5th of August there had been a resolution for the entire abolition of the Court of Chancery; and, though the first three Bills brought in for that immense purpose did not suit, the House had persevered, and a fourth Bill, for swiftly concluding suits then in Chancery, and determining future suits that would have gone to that Court, had passed the first and second readings. Some progress had also been made in that work of a revision and consolidation of the Statutes, and reduction of the whole body of English Law within the compass of a single volume of moderate size, which had been transmitted from the Rump, and for which the Committee for Law Reform had been specially appointed. If less progress had been made on the great question of the perpetuation or abolition of Tithes, and on the kindred question of the rights of patronage and presentation to livings, it was owing to the inherent difficulties of those questions and the differences of opinion about them in the House itself. Even they were in serious discussion, however, and the results were soon to appear. The House, as it had been constituted by Cromwell's Instrument, had still a whole year to live, and did not need to hurry measures.[1]

---

[1] Baillie (Letter from Glasgow dated July 27, 1653) III. 225—226; and an anonymous tract called *An Account of the late Violence, &c.*, the Thomason copy of which is dated Aug. 5, 1653.

It was in contemplation of a year of farther life thus still before it that the House, on the 1st and 2nd of November, made the necessary arrangements for renewing the Council of State, whose term of office expired on the 3rd. By a ballot on the first of these days, confirmed by open vote on the persons singly who came out highest in the ballot, *sixteen* of the existing Councillors were reappointed,—Cromwell at the head with 113 votes (his name having been on all the balloting papers without exception), Sir Gilbert Pickering next with 110 votes, Desborough next with seventy-four, and so to Harrison and Lord Lisle with fifty-eight votes each, and Mr. Mayor and Mr. Howard with fifty-seven each. On the same day, in the same manner, *fifteen* new Councillors were chosen, among whom were Colonel Anthony Rous, at the head of the poll with ninety-three votes, and Colonel Henry Cromwell, pretty near the top with sixty votes. Of the new Council of thirty-one thus appointed, and which was to be for six months only, it is unnecessary to give the list here. It will be enough to remember that from Nov. 3, 1653, fifteen of those who had been in office since July 14, ceased to be of the Council, and had their places taken by new men, and that among those so left out were Lambert, Fleetwood, and Hewson. The fifteen new men were, of course, all members of the Little Parliament. Hence there was not included among them one very important man of the late Rump, whom it was desirable to attach to the new system of things, and who was understood now to be willing,—therein differing from Vane, Hasilrig, Marten, and other sterner chiefs of the Rump, who stood bitterly aloof. It would have been much to have had Lord Commissioner Whitlocke on the new Council. Cromwell, however, had thought of that matter, and had obtained the benefit of Whitlocke's services in a still more splendid post. Viscount Lisle, who had been appointed Ambassador Extraordinary to Sweden by the Rump (ante p. 378), had never gone on his mission, and begged now to be excused from going; and the Council, of which Lisle was a member, had nominated Whitlocke instead. Whitlocke, receiving the news, with a letter from Cromwell, on the 4th of September, had hesitated dreadfully, and consulted with his wife. There was the long journey, with all the risks of the cold Swedish climate, besides the interruption of business at home; but, on the other hand, there was the danger of offending Cromwell by a refusal, not to speak of the dignity and emoluments of the post itself. Having agreed to go, Whitlocke had been formally appointed by the House on the 14th of September; and, the Council having settled that his allowance should be £6000 for the first six months, and that he should take Mr. Nathaniel Ingelo as his chaplain, and Mr. John Durie as one of his secretaries, he received his instructions from the House in a farewell audience on the 29th of October. On the 6th of November he was at sea for Sweden, with all his retinue.[1]

---

[1] Godwin, III. 570—576, and Commons Journals of various dates to Nov. 3, 1653.

The reason why it is unnecessary to give the list of the new Council, appointed Nov. 3, 1653, is that both it and the Little Parliament collapsed in little more than a month from that date. As often happens in the history of Governments, the Ecclesiastical Question was the cause of the collapse.

From the first meeting of the Parliament, faithful Commonwealth's men as were all the members, and not one of them but chosen by Cromwell and his advisers with some assurance "that there was in him faith in Jesus Christ, and love to all his people," there had been, as is inevitable in all such assemblies, a shedding into two parties. By temper or on principle many were more conservative than others, less disposed to sweeping or radical changes in the institutions still remaining. I infer also from the frequent closeness of the divisions from the first—a resolution often carried but by a majority of one or two votes—that the parties were pretty equally balanced, and that there was not sufficient momentum in the Radical party to give it the ascendancy. It may have been so in the question of Law-Reform, and it certainly was so in those questions of Tithes and Patronage of Livings which came on in November and December. On the Patronage subject, indeed, the Radical party did triumph; for on the 17th of November, after two divisions, of fifty-nine against forty-three on the previous question and fifty-eight against forty-one on the main question, it was resolved "That the power of Patrons to present to benefices shall from henceforth be taken away, and that a Bill be brought in for that purpose." In the votes on this resolution the tellers for the majority were Colonel Blount, Alderman Ireton (the dead Ireton's brother), Colonel Bennett, and Mr. Moyer, while the tellers for the minority were Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, Alderman Tichbourne, Colonel Hewson, and Mr. King.—The death-struggle, however, was reserved for the great question of Tithes and its adjuncts. Not till Dec. 2 did that question come before the House on report from the Committee. The report consisted of five clauses or paragraphs. In the first, it was recommended that there should be three Commissioners for each of seven circuits (London and Middlesex to be treated as one), who should go into all the counties, and, in association with select residents there, have power to eject unfit ministers, appoint fit ones to vacant livings, and unite or divide parishes. In the second, twenty-one persons were named as fit to be such Commissioners, some of them eminent ministers, whether Independent or Presbyterian, such as Arrowsmith, Owen, Thomas Goodwin, Caryl, Lockyer, Stephen Marshall, and Worthington, but others not ministers, such as Colonel Goffe and Major Haynes. In the third, it was recommended that all ministers approved as public preachers should enjoy the maintenance already settled by law, and have even farther encouragement. The fourth provided means for dealing with those who scrupled about the payment of tithes, but virtually determined that there should be no escape from the payment in one form or other—in money or land, if not in kind. The last and most emphatic paragraph was to the effect that the Committee, after having given their best consideration to the subject, were of opinion that Parliament should declare that Incumbents, Rectors, and others in receipt of tithes, had "a legal propriety" in the same.—Here was a blow for those who wanted the total abolition of tithes, and the absolute right of congregations to choose their own pastors, not to speak of those who had still hoped for the entire severance of Church from State, the extinction of a State-paid clergy, and a return to the pure Voluntaryism of the first Christian ages. Accordingly, from Tuesday the 6th to Saturday the 10th of December, there was one long and arduous debate over the Report, ending in a division, on the last of the five days, on the first clause or paragraph only. For the Yeas there voted fifty-four, with Colonels Sydenham and Jones for their tellers, and for the Noes fifty-six, with Colonels Danvers and James for their tellers. Thus, though only by *two* votes in a House which had re-mustered in its fullest strength for so important a battle, the Report was thrown out, and the Conservative policy on the subject of a National Church, and generally of ways and means for the Propagation of the Gospel, was defeated.[1]

---

[1] Commons Journals and Whitlocke under dates given.

Cromwell, there is sufficient proof, had come by this time to be in sympathy essentially with the Conservative policy on the Church question. He shrank from the idea of leaving England and Wales without an Established Church, or settled ministry paid by the State ; he saw no security for the maintenance and propagation of the Gospel otherwise ; and his definite ideal had come to be a State-Church that should comprehend Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, and pious men of all sound evangelical sects, and leave an ample or universal toleration of Dissent round about it. The vote of Saturday, Dec. 10, showing a House divided into two halves on this vital question, must therefore have confirmed the dissatisfaction with the House generally that had been already growing in his mind. The Little Parliament, with all its merits, had run aground. It had taxed its whole strength on the Church question, with a result that could not be accepted as decisive one way or the other; and, if it were to exist longer, it could only be by shelving the question altogether. That could not be; the House itself could not think of that; the country would go mad if that were attempted : what then was to be done ?

Though nominally a member of the House, and on some of its chief Committees, Cromwell had, with due regard to the extraordinary relations between it and himself, abstained from interference with its proceedings and left it independent. By his Instrument constituting it, he had empowered it to sit till Nov. 3, 1654, and had abjured the right of dissolving it, or even the successor it might appoint. From this difficulty Cromwell was relieved. Through the Sunday, Dec. 11, during which he must have been meditating it, Mr. Speaker Rous and others of the House were meditating it too; and on Monday the 12th their conclusion came to light. On that day, as soon as the Speaker had taken the Chair, Colonel Sydenham, the leader of the defeated Conservative minority of Saturday, made a speech to the effect that the House was now useless, that he and others could have no comfort in belonging to it, and that for the good of the Commonwealth it ought to resign its trust. The motion having been seconded by one or two others, with references to the Tithes question, several speakers rose to protest against such language, and maintain the fitness of the House for much good work yet. In this dilemma, on some signal given him, Mr. Rous did his part. Rising from the chair, and making the Serjeant-at-Arms shoulder the mace, he walked out of the House, followed by his adherents. The accounts of their number vary. One says that about eighty members went with Rous, leaving about thirty disconsolate in the House,—in which case not only must the House have been again at its fullest, but some twenty of the majority of Saturday must have been glad to be released from farther membership. Another account, however, gives about seventy as the total number present, and makes the secessionists about one-half only. Cromwell's word and an entry in the Commons Journals may be taken for the fact that more than one-half of those present waited on him immediately after leaving the House, and Cromwell's word alone for the fact that he did not know till that moment on what errand they had come. It was to deliver to Cromwell a signed paper, resigning back into his hands the trust with which he had vested them five months before. And so, on the 12th of December, 1653, "the Little Parliament" was at an end. It is generally remembered now with mere ridicule by that nickname of "The Barebones Parliament" which the English Royalists cleverly succeeded in affixing to it, and which will probably remain its distinguishing name for ever in English History. The Scottish Presbyterians had another nickname for it. Immediately after its dissolution they spoke of it as the "Daft Little Parliament." Yet, these nicknames notwithstanding, it was a very memorable Parliament, a convention of really enormous consequence. In a body of 144 persons, consisting of the most forward spirits, the most Cromwellian spirits, in England, Scotland, and Ireland, there had been publicly raised, as the paramount questions even then for the entire community of the British Islands, those questions of Disestablishment, Disendowment, and the utter abolition of a State-clergy, or even a Professional Clergy, which have maintained an existence, though a smothered one, in British politics ever since, and of which we have not yet seen the final explosion. About one-half of that little Assembly of politicians in the year 1653 were prepared, there and then, for Disestablishment to the utmost, or at least for a policy tending generally in that direction; and it was because the other half shuddered at the prospect, and some of those who had voted for it began also to shudder on second thoughts, that the Assembly was broken up, and stronger hands were called to the helm.[1]

---

[1] Commons Journals of dates.

What followed the dissolution of the Little Parliament is soon told. The Council of Officers having been summoned by Cromwell as the only power *de facto*, there were dialogues and deliberations, ending in the clear conclusion that the method of headship in a "Single Person" for his whole life must now be tried in the Government of the Commonwealth, and that Cromwell must be that "Single Person." The title of *King* was actually proposed; but, as there were objections to that, *Protector* was chosen as a title familiar in English History, and of venerable associations. Accordingly, Cromwell having consented, and all preparations having been made, he was, on Friday, Dec. 16, in a great assembly of civic, judicial, and military dignitaries, solemnly sworn and installed in the Chancery Court, Westminster Hall, as LORD PROTECTOR

---

[1] Cromwell's subsequent speeches; Commons Journals, Dec. 12, 1653; Parl. Hist. III. 1414—1416; Godwin, III. 578—592; Blair's Life, 311.

OF THE COMMONWEALTH OF ENGLAND, SCOTLAND, AND IRELAND. There were some of his adherents hitherto who did not like this new elevation of their hero, and forsook him in consequence, regarding any experiment of the Single Person method in Government as a treason to true Republicanism and Cromwell's assent to it as unworthy of him. Among these was Harrison. Lambert, on the other hand, had been the main agent in the change, and took a conspicuous part in the installation-ceremony. In fact, pretty generally throughout the country, and even among the Presbyterians, the elevation of Cromwell to some kind of sovereignty had come to be regarded as an inevitable necessity of the time, the only possible salvation of the Commonwealth from the anarchy, or wild and experimental idealism, in matters civil and religious, which had been the visible drift at last of the Barebones or Daft Little Parliament.[1]

---

[1] Carlyle's Cromwell, II. 369—372; Baillie, III. 289.

CHAPTER II.

MILTON'S LIFE AND SECRETARYSHIP FROM APRIL 20 TO DEC. 16, 1653.

MILTON'S APPROVAL OF CROMWELL'S *COUP D'ETAT* : A PRINTED LETTER OF HIS ON THE SUBJECT, ADDRESSED PROBABLY TO MARVELL : EXTRACTS : TRACES OF MILTON IN THE MINUTES OF CROMWELL'S INTERIM COUNCIL AND IN THOSE OF THE TWO COUNCILS OF THE BAREBONES PARLIAMENT : HIS POSITION NOW VIRTUALLY THAT OF LATIN SECRETARY EXTRAORDINARY, WITH PHILIP MEADOWS FOR HIS SUBSTITUTE : FOUR MORE STATE LETTERS OF MILTON (NOS. XLI—XLIV) : RENEWED INTERCOURSE BETWEEN MILTON AND ROGER WILLIAMS DURING WILLIAMS'S STAY IN ENGLAND : CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN WILLIAMS AND MRS. SADLEIR : THAT LADY'S OPINION OF WILLIAMS AND ALSO OF MILTON : EXTRACTS FROM A LETTER OF WILLIAMS TO JOHN WINTHROP : MILTON'S TRANSLATIONS OF PSALMS I—VIII : PUBLICATION OF THREE MORE TRACTS AGAINST MILTON, TWO OF THEM BY GERMAN JURISTS : THE REAL ROWLAND : LAST DAYS AND DEATH OF SALMASIUS : LETTER OF HEINSIUS ON RECEIPT OF THE NEWS : MILTON'S REPLY TO THE *REGII SANGUINIS CLAMOR* IN PROGRESS AT LAST.

THAT Milton approved of Cromwell's *coup d'état* of April 20, 1653, dissolving the Rump of the Long Parliament, appears abundantly from the sequel of his life, but seems to have been attested expressly at the time. Among the pamphlets of approbation that immediately came out in London was one in twenty pages with this title: "*A Letter to a Gentleman in the Country, touching the Dissolution of the late Parliament and the Reasons thereof. . .*[1] *London, printed by F. Leach, for Richard Baddeley, at his shop within the Middle Temple Gate,* 1653." The Letter itself is dated "London, May 3, 1653," and signed merely "N. LL."; but in the Thomason copy of the tract in the British Museum, where "May 6" is inscribed as the date of publication, the words "*By Mr. John Milton,*" are also written on the title-page. This, though going a good way towards proof, would not be decisive, as in several other cases Thomason was led by rumour to credit Milton with tracts which were not really his. Let us look at the tract itself. It begins:—

Sir,—Yours of the 27th past came safe, and with it your admiration of this great change which hath happened in the dissolution of the late Parliament; which I do not at all wonder at: for, as this Island hath afforded the greatest Revolutions that I think any memory affords us, of any time or place, so I believe this to be the greatest of them,—and so much the greater that it was done, in a manner, in an instant, without contestation, without effusion of blood, and, for anything I can perceive, without the least resentment of those whom it generally concerns. But, when I shall put you in remembrance of what I have often enforced to you,—or, to say better, discoursed, for the other is needless,—that the ways of Providence are unscrutable, and such as, though they seem to us unexpected and temerarious, yet are carried on with such a strange and supreme kind of design, it will be easy for an humble and an acquiescing mind to see that by several invisible degrees they bring forth their last and proposed intendments, yea with those instruments which seem and intend to do the contrary. What man could have supposed, after the dissolution of the Parliament preceding this last [the Short Parliament, dissolved May 1840], to have had another so soon? And, for this last, who could have imagined that by Act it should have continued, much more have gloriously undertaken the defence of an injured People by open arms against an oppressor, and that these undertakings, with admirable variety of success, should have been crowned with the extirpation of tyranny and the decollation of the person of a tyrant: that that great Omniscience should so bless the endeavours of a Commonwealth, now, as I may say, in its very swaddling-clouts, as by them absolutely to reduce these dominions in three years, which a series of proud and lusty monarchs could not in six centuries do,—besides that naval opposition so fortunately and gloriously made against the greatest maritime enemy in Europe, or, to speak with due acknowledgment, on the Earth? Yet are these men, after all these vigorous and happy actions, suddenly dispersed like down blown off a thistle, and their power devolved into such hands which, as God hath made instrumental in these strange emanations of His Divine Will, so He intends to make further use of, to the finishing of that great work which by such visible signs He hath made appear He hath in hand for the glory of His name, the felicity of these nations, and, I believe, for the blessed alteration of all Europe."

---

[1] In the gap there is this motto from Seneca:

"Senec. Troad.

Quæris quo jaceas post obitum loco?
Quo non nata jacent."

Proceeding in this strain, the writer considers—"*first,* the "manner of Government by the late Parliament; *then,* the "Right of Obedience to superior Powers; and, *lastly,* the "effects or events that may come upon the late change." Under each of the three heads his argument is in defence of Cromwell's bold act. The late Parliament, though it had done miracles, had degenerated. The members had become "so familiar with "each other that, what by their ordinary at Whitehall, and "what by their conferences at the Speaker's Chamber before "the sitting of the House, little was determined but out of "design and faction": business was in arrear; poor creditors and petitioners were unattended to unless they could employ solicitors; there was jobbing and self-seeking of all kinds. He comes then to the point. "I know your objection before-"hand,—that the action of the Lord General in the dis-"solution was somewhat rough and barbarous; and I shall not "trouble you with a long answer. As to his person, as he "hath in the field declared himself one of the noblest assertors "of our Liberty, and as great an enlarger of our territories as "ever was, so, as far as any particular designs of his own in "point of Government, it must be a scrutiny greater than "human that can discover how he either intended to invade "us or to make us a prey to any ambition of his. And there- "fore, if upon this grand revolution he might appear to his "enemies passionate, yet, considering the extremities that "great minds fall into, and the great trust committed to him, "it will appear nothing but the discharge of that duty that "lay upon him." The letter concludes thus, and the reader will note the words put here in Italics:—

"I believe this change or event will contribute more to our happiness than if we had still languished under our former sufferings. I have told you what the Head of the Army is: to tell you of the rest were a vain flattery and inconsideracy; but, since God hath owned them as such excellent and worthy persons, and made them glorious in their several generations, I must be content to look up and reverence them. 'Tis true great truths are hard in the labour, and many glorious men have been cut out of the womb: therefore wonder not if the account that they may give you be slow, or possibly slower than you expect. *I am no member of their Councils, and by a late infirmity less able to attend them;* yet, if I can believe anything, or understand men when they make the clearest professions, they intend all noble things, both as to the glory of our good God, the making happy of this poor nation, settling the liberties of it, and reducing of us into one mind and one way. But these are not only wishes of mine, but hopes and certain expectancies; and I believe they will convince those men to be liars that speak against them. But now I think I have put you to all the trials of your patience,—which, *if my infirmity had not been* (*which confined me to my chamber*), I could not have done; but I rely so much on your candour, and I believe you think so well of my veracity, as I want not the impudence to affirm myself, however you like it,

Your affectionate Servant,

"London: May 3, 1653. N. LL."

The style of this letter quite accords with the supposition that it was roughly dictated by Milton in answer to a letter from some friend in the country who had been more staggered by the *coup d'état* than Milton had been; and the words in Italics appear like an open avowal of the authorship. The writer makes no concealment of his being a person about the Council, who could speak of Cromwell and his Army associates on the faith of the impressions made on him by habitual and close observation of them, and he defines himself still more exactly as a person about the Council who was prevented by a recent infirmity from giving so much attendance there as formerly; and at that particular moment was confined to his chamber by the same infirmity. Who could this be but Milton? To be sure, the anonymous was not in Milton's way; but the anonymity here is more like a printer's freak than an author's disguise. What if the person addressed were Andrew Marvell, and Milton, when his leave was asked to publish the letter, suggested that he had sufficiently revealed himself in the text, that his name on the title-page was unnecessary and might be inexpedient in his position, and that the last letters of the surnames of the writer and the person addressed might be clubbed as a substitute? There was, I may add, no person about the Council whose real initials were N. LL. In short I believe that Thomason is in this case quite right.

The following extracts from the Council Order Books will suggest pretty clearly the state of Milton's Secretaryship through that Interim Dictatorship of Cromwell of which he approved so heartily in the main :—

CROMWELL'S INTERIM COUNCIL OF THIRTEEN (ante pp. 498–499): April 29—July 14, 1653.

Friday, April 29 :—Present : Lord General Cromwell, Major-General Lambert, Major-General Harrison, Mr. Carew, Colonel Bennett, Colonel Sydenham, Mr. Stapley, and Mr. Strickland. Ordered "That MR. THURLOE do prepare and present to the Council "the state of his office, what persons are employed therein, and the "whole charge thereof."

Monday, May 9 :—"That MR. GUALTER FROST be assistant to "Mr. Thurloe, Secretary to the Council."

Tuesday, June 28 (afternoon meeting). "That the Paper now "read in answer to the Paper of the Lords Deputies from the "United Provinces be approved of, translated into Latin, and "delivered unto them; and that Sir Gilbert Pickering, Major-"General Harrison, Mr. Strickland, and Mr. Sydenham, or any "three of them, be appointed Commissioners to deliver the said "Paper unto them."

Saturday, July 9:—"Upon the reading of the letter written "from MR. MILTON to Sir Gilbert Pickering, it is ordered that Sir "Gilbert Pickering be desired to confer with the Doctors mentioned "in the said letter, and to know from them what quantity of paper "they desire to import free of custom and excise towards the carrying on of their work of a New Translation of the Bible." One of the last schemes of the Rump had been a New Translation of the Bible out of the Original Tongues, to supersede King James's Authorized Version of 1611. A Bill for that purpose, with the presentation of names of persons fit to be employed in the work, had been ordered Jan. 11, and had actually been brought in and passed the first reading March 4, 1652–3 (Commons Journals of these dates); and now Cromwell's Government, on some application from Milton about the paper for the work, signify clearly that they mean it to go on. Was Milton to take part in the great work, in association with Owen, Thomas Goodwin, and other learned Divines? At all events, Milton's connexion with the Council had not ceased. Though there is no express mention as yet of his reappointment to his Secretaryship, the Translation of the Paper for the Dutch Ambassadors ordered in last entry seems to have been referred to him as a matter of course; and one notes that Sir Gilbert Pickering, who had been named first on the Committee to take charge of the Translated Paper, was the medium of Milton's present communication to the Council. Had Pickering been at Milton's house about the translation in the interim, and had Milton talked of this other matter?

FIRST COUNCIL OF THE BAREBONES PARLIAMENT (ante p. 506): July 14—Nov. 3, 1653.

Wednesday, Aug. 10:—"That the answer to the Paper of the Lord "Lagerfeldt, Public Minister of the Queen of Sweden, of the 3rd "of August, now read in the Council, be translated into Latin, "and delivered unto the said Lord Lagerfeldt by the Committee "of the Council tomorrow in the afternoon."

Friday, Oct. 14:—"That Mr. Thurloe do present to the Council, "between this and Monday morning, the names of two or three "persons whom he shall judge fit to be employed as assistant to "the business of Foreign Affairs, to the end the Council may out "of them make choice of such of them as they shall judge fit."

Monday, Oct. 17:—Thurloe had meanwhile reported the names of several fit persons, with this result:—"That WILLIAM JESSOP, "ESQ., be employed to assist Mr. Thurloe in the despatch of the "business of Foreign Affairs," salary afterwards to be fixed; "That "MR. PHILIP MEADOWS, now employed by the Council in Latin "translations, do also assist Mr. Thurloe in the despatch of Foreign "Affairs, and that he have in consideration thereof £100 per annum, "to be added to the £100 per annum he now receives of the Council." This will receive comment.

Tuesday, Oct. 18:—HARTLIB to have £150 in arrear paid him, and Parliament to be moved to pay him also £25 on some account: "all towards his maintenance and subsistence and for his encouragement in his public services to the Commonwealth."—Same day, "*Ordered,* That the Committee for Foreign Affairs do meet "to-morrow morning," to consider papers given in by the Swedish Minister and the proper answers to them, and to report to the Council with all convenient speed; "and MR. MEADOWS is to be "sent unto to attend that Committee, who are to sit to-morrow "morning by eight of the clock."

SECOND COUNCIL OF THE BAREBONES PARLIAMENT (ante p. 512): Nov. 3—Dec. 12, 1653 (only five weeks in office).

Thursday, Nov. 3:—First meeting of this Council. Present: The Lord General Cromwell, Colonel Montague, Colonel George Fleetwood, Lord Viscount Lisle, Mr. John Sadler, Mr. Jervas Bennett, Mr. Howard, Colonel Sydenham, Colonel Barton, Mr. Anlaby, Dr. Jonathan Goddard, Captain Stone, Sir Christopher Wolseley, Colonel Jones, Colonel Bingham, Colonel Henry Cromwell, Sir William Roberts, Mr. Carew, Mr. Strickland, Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, Mr. Mayor, Mr. Rous, Major-General Desborough. All these having been sworn in, there were various orders natural to a first meeting, including these:—"That MR. JOHN THURLOE be Secretary unto the "present Council of State; That MR. WILLIAM JESSOP be Secretary "Assistant to the Council; That MR. GUALTER FROST be Secretary "Assistant to the Council; That MR. JOHN MILTON do remain in "the same capacity he was in to the last Council, and that he have "the same allowance for it as formerly."

Monday, Nov. 7:—"That the Recredential Letter to the Helvetian "Cantons of Switzerland now read and approved of be translated, "signed, and delivered by Sir Oliver Fleming to Johannes Jacobus "Stockarus [ante p. 383], agent for the said Cantons, being now to "return home."

Thursday, Nov. 24:—"That the Instrument prepared for the "Duke of Holstein [*alias* the Count of Oldenburg: ante p. 424] "and now read, be approved of, and that it be humbly presented to "the Parliament for their approbation; and Mr. Lawrence is desired "to present the same accordingly."—It was read in the House, both in Latin and English, Dec. 1; and Mr. Speaker Rous was empowered to sign and seal the same for the Parliament.

Milton's official position through the Interim Dictatorship defines itself, from these extracts, thus:—He had been retained in his old post by Cromwell for the Interim and mainly military Council of Thirteen; he had been tacitly continued in the post by the First Council of the Barebones

Parliament; and he had been expressly reappointed to the post by the second Council of that Parliament at their first and very full meeting, and in Cromwell's presence. But the post had been necessarily modified to meet the inconvenience of Milton's blindness, in the manner suggested by Milton himself, through Bradshaw, to the last Council of the Rump, shortly before the Dissolution. Marvell, whom Milton would have preferred as his Assistant, not having been appointed in succession to Weckherlin, Thurloe had brought in, either during the time of the Interim Council of Thirteen, or early in the time of the first Barebones Council, a certain MR. PHILIP MEADOWS, to do Latin translations, with an allowance of £100 a year; and this Mr. Meadows, apparently a young man, had given such satisfaction that, on the 17th of October, his duties in the Foreign Department were extended and his salary raised to £200 a year. At the same time, Thurloe's staff was increased by the appointment of a MR. WILLIAM JESSOP to give miscellaneous assistance in the same department; and the next Council, at its first meeting on Nov. 3, retained this Jessop, only making him complete co-assistant to Thurloe with the long-experienced Mr. Gualter Frost.[1] Meadows, rather than Jessop, one can see, suited as Milton's substitute for those duties of the Foreign Secretaryship for which he was incapacitated; and one notes particularly, from the order of Oct. 18, that Meadows was relied on in the matter of personal attendance. Altogether, we may now say that Milton, though still Latin Secretary, and still doing work, had become *Latin Secretary Extraordinary*.

Still doing work, we have said. Yet the Latin State-Letters for the Commonwealth actually claimed by Milton as of his own writing through the period of our present chapter are very few. Meadows may have been doing most of the work, or Milton may have omitted papers of his own not worth preserving. The following is a dated inventory of those he does claim:—

---

[1] Jessop may have been that "William Jessop," the friend of Arthur Wilson, author of "The Life and Reign of King James the First," to whom Wilson, by a codicil to his will, dated Sept. 28, 1650, left his "best diamond ring" (Wood's Ath. III. 320).

(XLI.) To THE COUNT OF OLDENBURG (here styled by all his titles as "Heir of Norway, Duke of Sleswig," &c.), *July* 2, 1653:—This is a Letter from Cromwell's Interim Council of Thirteen, assuring the Count that the former good relations between him and the Commonwealth will not be disturbed by the new state of things in England. There have been great recent actions, and signs of the Divine help to the present rulers even beyond what had been vouchsafed to their predecessors; but they were not so elated with successes as not to desire to cultivate peace with all, and especially with such real friends as the Count.—Before this letter can have reached the Count, I may add, he had despatched to England a new minister with credential letters,—not Milton's friend, Hermann Mylius, this time, but a PAUL DE WIRTZ. His letters were reported to the Barebones Parliament by Speaker Rous on the 22nd of August, and his business referred to the Council of State. The result was a new Safeguard for the Count, read in Council Nov. 24 (see order of that date), and in the House in Latin and English Dec. 1, and then ordered to be signed by the Speaker and despatched (Commons Journal of dates). It is just possible that the Safeguard given in Thurloe, I. 385–6, may be this Safeguard of Dec., 1653, and not the previous one of Feb., 1651–2, which Milton wrote (ante p. 424). But the Latin seems Milton's.

(XLII.) To THE SWISS EVANGELICAL CANTONS OF ZURICH, BERN, GLARUS, BASEL, SCHAFFHAUSEN, APPENZEL, &c., *Oct.* 8, 1653:—The English draft of this letter had been reported to the House from the Council, Oct. 4, and referred back to the Council for translation into Latin, Speaker Rous to sign it. The letter is peculiarly affectionate, and I should guess the entire sentiment and expression, and not the Latin only, to be Milton's. Letters received from the Cantons, dated as far back as Dec. 24, and presented to the Rump, are now acknowledged; and there is the most ample testimony of respect for the Swiss, their character, and their history. "We thank Almighty God in the first place," says the Letter, "who "has raised up and constituted you and your so many noble "communities as a firm stronghold in those parts for all the "orthodox, walled round and fortified not so much by those "mountain enclosures, as by your own inborn courage, piety, and "most prudent and just administration of civil affairs, and also by "your federate faith to each other." It is remembered also that the Swiss were almost the first people in all Europe, "since the "bringing in of the tyrannies of barbarous Kings from the North," that had recovered their liberty. Who would not listen to counsels of peace from such a quarter? Let the Cantons be assured that their counsels have been taken in good part, and that the peace with the Dutch which they especially advise is the very thing the Commonwealth has itself desired and laboured for; but let the Cantons at the same time remember what provocations the Commonwealth has received, and how it has been compelled to make good its place in Europe by means which the Swiss themselves have ere now had to employ. Meanwhile may the blessing promised to peace-makers rest on the Cantons!—The Recredential Letters ordered by the Council, Nov. 7, for STOCKARUS, the agent for the Cantons (see order of that date), were to enable him to carry back this missive. *They* may have been done by Meadows.

(XLIII & XLIV.) TO THE MARQUIS OF LEIDA (Spanish Governor of Dunkirk), and TO THE SPANISH AMBASSADOR IN LONDON (Cardenas): *both undated.* The two refer to the same subject—the seizure of an English merchant vessel and maltreatment of the crew by a Spanish privateer from Ostend. Redress is demanded.

Milton, it is clear, must have been a good deal at leisure in his own house in Petty France through all this time of Cromwell's Interim Dictatorship and the sitting of the Barebones Parliament. Of the friends that came about him there, to talk with him and cheer him in his blindness, we already know something, and shall yet hear more; but there was one friend of whom we must take notice at this point, because he was but a visitor from the other side of the Atlantic, and was soon to disappear thither again. This was Roger Williams.

He had made Milton's acquaintance, as I believe, in his former visit of 1643–4—ever since which time Milton must have remembered him well; and no sooner had he returned on his new mission in 1652 (ante pp. 395–396) than Milton, now a doubly important man to Williams because of his public position, must have been one of the first of his old London acquaintances that he sought out. He had found him in March or April, 1652, in the first threatenings and anxieties of his total blindness; and all through the rest of that year, and the whole of 1653, Williams, while prosecuting with the Council the special business that had brought him over,—and also, as we have seen, flinging himself with all his strength and ingenuity, as became the acknowledged theorist-in-chief of Voluntaryism in Religion, into the great discussion which he found going on in England on the question of an Established Church or no Established Church,—had varied his intimacy with Sir Henry Vane, his calls on Lawrence, Harrison, and Hugh Peters, and his occasional interviews with Cromwell himself, by visits to the blind Latin Secretary. What a kindred spirit he had found in Milton, and how strongly Milton had fascinated him, appears from a strange correspondence at the time between Williams and an English lady, whose name was Mrs. Sadleir. She also was an old acquaintance of Williams's—a daughter, indeed, of that great lawyer and judge, Sir Edward Coke, to whom he had owed, thirty years before, his education at Charter House School and his introduction into life, and of whom, in all his Transatlantic wanderings, and all his vicissitudes of opinion, he had continued to think with reverence and gratitude.[1] She was, therefore, also the aunt of Milton's old pupil, Cyriack Skinner, whose mother was another daughter of the great lawyer.[2] The good lady, however, who seems to have lived in the country, abhorred the Commonwealth and all its connexions, and was an ardent Royalist and Church-of-England woman. Hence, when Williams, in his affectionate fidelity to her father's memory, longed to renew old relations with the family, and sought to engage her in correspondence, and to reason with her, in his tumultuously fervid way, about this and that, she was both indignant and perplexed. Three letters of his to her, all undated, but written in 1652 or 1653 from his London lodgings in St. Martin's, together with copies of her replies, and a prefixed note to the whole in her own hand, are still extant in the Library of Trinity College, Cambridge. The prefixed note runs thus: "This Roger "Williams, when he was a youth, would in a short hand take "sermons, and speeches in the Star Chamber, and present "them to my dear father. He, seeing him so hopeful a "youth, took such a liking to him that he sent him into "Sutton's Hospital [the Charter House], and he was the "second that was placed there. Full little did he think "that he would have proved such a rebel to God, the King, "and his country. I leave his letters, that, if ever he have "the face to return into his native country, Tyburn may give "his welcome." This was written after our present date, and probably after the Restoration, when Williams was permanently back in America; but in the correspondence itself there is almost equal decisiveness on the lady's part. With Williams's first letter, he had sent Mrs. Sadleir a copy of a book of his, called *Experiments of Spiritual Life and Health, and their Preservatives,* written while he was among the Indians, and which he had just published in London, with a dedication to Lady Vane. Being a book of practical religion, this seems to have passed; but, when he accompanied his second letter, which was more controversial, with a copy of his *Bloody Tenent*, or famous plea for Universal Toleration, Mrs. Sadleir drew herself up. She returned it unread, entreating him "to trouble her no more in this kind." Williams, not a man easily rebuffed, had then sent his third letter, arguing with her sharply about the execution of Charles I. and other matters, and recommending to her Milton's *Eikonoklastes.* The lady had then closed the correspondence with some very plain speaking. "It seems you have a face of brass, so that you cannot blush," she had written to Williams, adding, "for the foul and false aspersions" he had "cast upon that King of ever-blessed memory, Charles the Martyr," this one observation: "None but such a villain as yourself would have wrote them." Nor did Milton escape. "For Melton's book "that you desire I should read, if I be not mistaken, that is "he that has wrote a book of the Lawfulness of Divorce; "and, if report says true, he had at that time two or three "wives living. This perhaps were good doctrine in New "England, but it is most abominable in Old England. For "his book that he wrote against the late King that you "would have me read, you should have taken notice of God's "judgment upon him, who struck him with blindness; and, "as I have heard, he was fain to have the help of one Andrew "Marvell, or else he could not have finished that most "accursed libel. God has begun his punishment upon him "here; his punishment will be hereafter in Hell." Even Jeremy Taylor, it seems, was too liberal for this stiff lady-Royalist. "I have also read Taylor's book of the Liberty of Professing" [*sic*], she says, . . . : "I say it and you would make a good fire." She concludes, "Trouble me no more "with your letters, for they are very troublesome to her that "wishes you in the place from whence you came."[1]

---

[1] Vol. II. p. 560.

[2] Vol. III. p. 567.

Whether Williams told Milton of his correspondence with Cyriack Skinner's aunt, and of its issue, we cannot tell. If he did, Milton was too much accustomed to such judgments of himself as Mrs. Sadleir's to care very much. "*Liber igni, Author furcâ, dignissimi*" ("Book richly deserving the fire, Author the gallows,") was the inscription which the Earl of Bridgewater, Earl since his father's death in 1649, but remembered better by Milton as the young Viscount Brackley who had acted the part of the elder brother in *Comus*, had written with his own hand on the title-page of a copy of the *Defensio pro Populo Anglicano* which he had procured for his library.[2] Without positively knowing them, Milton must have guessed many things of the kind in very respectable quarters.

Certain it is that Roger Williams, not troubling Mrs. Sadleir any more, drew closer and closer to Milton during the rest of his stay. In a letter of his describing, for one of his American friends, after his return, his occupations while he had been in England, he says, "It pleased the Lord to call me, for "some time and with some persons, to practise the Hebrew, "the Greek, Latin, French, and Dutch. The Secretary of the "Council, Mr. Milton, for my Dutch I read him, read me "many more languages. Grammar rules begin to be esteemed "a tyranny. I taught two gentlemen, a Parliament man's "sons, as we teach our children English, by words, phrases, "and constant talk." The passage suggests many hours in Milton's society at intervals through the year 1653, spent in the exchange of Milton's higher lessons in the classic tongues (not literally his *readings* in them) for Williams's useful stock of Dutch acquired in America, with colloquies moreover on the best mode of teaching languages, and an introduction of

---

[1] To the kindness of the Rev. Robert Sinker, M.A., Librarian of Trinity College, I am indebted for information about the Sadleir-Williams correspondence, and for being able to give the extracts from the letters in a correct form. I had seen the MSS. myself in the Library previously.

[2] Still extant, I believe. See Todd (ed. 1852) I. 80, note.

Williams, through Milton, to his own views on that subject and those of Comenius and Hartlib. The war with the Dutch, it is to be remembered, was then at its height, and some knowledge of Dutch was particularly desirable for official purposes round the Council. About this very war with the Dutch, we find, Williams was much concerned, wishing it over and the two Commonwealths at peace. But, indeed, of all that went on in England Williams had not ceased to be watchful. In the particular business of his mission, as we know, his main trust from the first had been in his friend Vane. The business had been long delayed by the Dutch War and other things, and there was strong opposition at the Council in the interest of Massachusetts and the other Confederated Colonies. By the beginning of 1653, however, some progress had been made; and on the 1st of April in that year Williams had been able to send home to his fellow-colonists a letter very hopeful for the rest. "Under "God," he had written, "the great anchor of our ship is Sir "Henry, who will do as the eye of God leads him; and he "faithfully promised me that he would observe the motion of "the New England business while I staid some ten weeks "with his lady in Lincolnshire." The letter was actually written at Vane's country-seat of Belleau in that county, whither Williams had gone for a holiday, while Vane remained in town on his great affairs. Alas! within three weeks (April 20) there had come Cromwell's Dissolution of the Rump and of its Council, dismissing Vane from all farther concern in great affairs, and remitting him to retirement in the same country-house. It had been this that had detained Williams all through 1653 in England, prolonging his opportunities of seeing Milton and others. Of Hugh Peters, whom he seems to have visited repeatedly in his rooms at Whitehall, he gives a curiously interesting account. "He himself "told me," says Williams, "that that library wherein we "were together was Canterbury's [i. e. had been Laud's] and "given him by the Parliament. His wife [who was insane] "lives from him not wholly, but much distracted. He tells "me he had but £200 a year, and he allowed her four-score "*per annum* of it. Surely the most holy Lord is most wise "in all the trials He exerciseth his people with. He told me "that his affliction from his wife stirred him up to action "abroad, and, when success tempted him to pride, the bitterness in his bosom-comforts was a cooler and a bridle to "him." Notwithstanding the *coup d'état* which had shelved Sir Harry Vane, Williams was not alienated from Cromwell, but seems to have observed him with continued respect, if not perfect sympathy, through his Interim Dictatorship and the time of the Barebones Parliament. Nay, he remained long enough in England to see the establishment of the Protectorate, and not be very much shocked at that. When he did leave England to recross the Atlantic, early in 1654—his business even then not brought to a final close, but his colleague Mr. Clarke remaining behind to prosecute it farther —it was with kindly letters in the Protector's name intended to secure him and his Narragansett people from future molestation by the neighbour New England Colonies, and also with a special letter from Sir Harry Vane, in his character of retired statesman, addressed to the Narragansett people themselves, urging them to more of union and peace and to continued trust in men like Williams. And so, though Williams was to live for thirty years more, becoming President of his colony for two years in succession, and exerting himself vigorously to the end in the general politics of infant America, he had seen his last of England, and only vague news of him from time to time were to reach Milton while *he* lived.[1]

In the shape of verse we have nothing of Milton's belonging to the year 1653, except his Translation of Psalms I—VIII, and possibly his Translation of the Fifth Ode of Horace, Book I. Both are metrical experiments that may have amused an hour or two of his blindness. The Horatian Ode is "rendered almost word for word, without rhyme, according to the Latin measure, as near as the language will permit." The Eight Psalms are dated by himself as done in this year—Psalm I. on some day in the year not specified, Psalm II. on the 8th of August, Psalm III. on the 9th, Psalm IV. on the 10th, Psalm V. on the 12th, Psalm VI. on the 13th, and Psalms VII. and VIII. on the 14th. The last of these days, on which Milton dictated two Psalms, was a Sunday. The principle of these Translations was different from that adopted for the nine Psalms (LXXX—LXXXVIII) done in April 1648. These were all in the common service metre; but in the present experiment each Psalm is in a metre chosen for itself, and some of the metres are very unusual. Thus Psalm III., or David's Psalm when he fled from Absalom:—

---

[1] Knowles's Life of Roger Williams (1834), and Gammell's Life of him (1845). The extracts are from a Letter of Williams, written at Providence, July 12, 1654, i.e. shortly after his return to America, and addressed to his friend John Winthrop, at Pequod. Knowles gives it in full at pp. 261—264. Hugh Peters, by his first wife, was closely related to Winthrop; the wife mentioned in the text, was his second wife, married in America in 1639.

"Lord, how many are my foes!
How many those
That in arms against me rise!
Many are they
That of my life distrustfully thus say,
'No help for him in God there lies.'
But thou, Lord, art my shield, my glory;
Thee through my story
The exalter of my head I count:
Aloud I cried
Unto Jehovah; He soon full replied,
And heard me from His Holy Mount.
I lay and slept; I waked again:
For my sustain
Was the Lord. Of many millions
The populous rout
I fear not, though, encamping round about,
They pitch against me their pavilions."

Milton's own foes were still pitching their pavilions against him. To the Salmasian, or rather pro-Salmasian, pamphlets already out, there were added in this year at least three.—Two of them appeared together in this form: "*Caspari Ziegleri Lipsiensis circa Regicidium Anglorum Exercitationes. Accedit Jacobi Schalleri Dissertatio ad loca quædam Miltoni. Lugd. Batavorum, Apud Johannem à Sambix.* 1653" ("Exercitations of Caspar Ziegler of Leipsic concerning the Regicide of the English: To which is added Jacobus Schaller's Dissertation on some passages of Milton. Leyden: sold by John à Sambix. 1653"). The volume is a small one of 262 pages, of which 157 are Ziegler's, and the rest Schaller's. Ziegler, who was a German jurist of some note, had written his "Exercitations," he says, more than two years before, but had kept them back. Meanwhile Milton's portentous *Defence for the English People against Salmasius* had appeared, and an early copy had been sent to Leipsic from Holland. "It is impossible to express," he says, "how greedily it was passed about and read." He had been able himself to get the use of it but for part of a day. He had had high expectations from it at first, and had even noted points of suggestion in it; but the violence of the attack on Salmasius had disgusted him, and he had now prefixed a Preface to his "Exercitations" to express that feeling. "Salmasius, though a man of "stupendous erudition, is still not of such authority with me "that I should think myself obliged to yield a blind assent "to his doctrines; but I could not but be indignant when" &c. Ziegler has then some harsh words about Milton, before proceeding to his "Exercitations." These are eight in all, each propounding and arguing a thesis about Government and the rights of Kings, relevant to his condemnation of the English Regicide. Schaller's "Dissertation" follows. He was "Doctor of Theology and Professor of Practical Philosophy" (in the University of Strasburg?); and he says that, though he had been astounded, with the rest of the world, by the news of the execution of Charles I., and by Milton's defence of the deed, he would not, as a foreigner, have mixed himself up with an English controversy, had not Milton propounded "certain general principles" subversive of all Government, and therefore requiring exposure. This he proceeds to give, quoting passages from Milton, with the numbers of the pages where they occur, and commenting on them in a grave way, without abuse, and with learned references. Neither his nor Ziegler's part of the book has any real force; but the joint publication at Leyden of anti-Miltonic tracts by two German scholars may have been thought worth something in the Salmasian circle.—In the same year, but later, appeared a small duodecimo, called "*Polemica, sive Supplementum ad Apologiam Anonymam pro Rege et Populo Anglicano adversus Jo. Miltoni Defensionem Populi Anglicani, &c. Per Jo. Rowlandum, Pastorem Anglicum.* 1653" ("Polemica, or Supplement to the Anonymous Apology for the King and People of England against John Milton's Defence of the English People, &c. By John Rowland, English Pastor. 1653"). Here we have, in his own person at last, the author of the silly previous book against Milton which had been attributed to Bishop Bramhall, and which Milton's nephew, John Phillips, had answered on that understanding. "I am "not John Bramhall, courtly Bishop of Derry," the real author now writes; "but John Rowland, Englishman, pastor of a "particular church [in Antwerp?], and not ashamed of my "name either, which is an orthodox one in the Church, and "has passed into the proverb, *A Rowland for an Oliver.*" He would have had this Supplement or second Apology against Milton out long ago, he explains, but that the printers, knowing him to be a poor man, had refused to give him anything for it, or even to print it at their own expence. Names and titles now went for everything, and, had the title-page borne the name of Salmasius or Heinsius, it would have been very different! Meanwhile he observes that a reply to his former Apology has come forth, written by a certain "John," calling himself "Phillips," but whether really Phillips or Milton himself he does not know. No need of much answer to that book, the chief peculiarity of which was that it had blunderingly promoted a poor English minister in Antwerp to the Bishopric of Derry and furiously attacked the real Bishop of Derry for a crime of which he was quite innocent. As to the bad Latin with which he had been charged by Phillips, it might be enough to say that for fourteen years he had not had either grammar or dictionary to trust to, except what he carried in his head.[1]—To these evidences of the continued horror about Milton's books abroad add the following news from Ratisbon just at the close of the year,—"It was "concluded also in the same place that all the books of "Miltonius should be searched for and confiscated, with all "such books." The "place" where this conclusion was come to was no other than the Diet of the German Empire, then sitting at Ratisbon, with the Emperor Ferdinand III. (1637—1657) in the midst of it. Though individual princes of the Empire, like the Count of Oldenburg, might truckle to the English Commonwealth, the Kaiser himself had espoused the cause of Charles II., and resolved to direct the imperial policy towards a restoration of the fallen monarchy.[1]

---

[1] Bramhall was naturally annoyed at being confounded with this silly old body, and wrote from Antwerp to his son in May 1654 as follows: "That silly book which he [Milton] ascribes to me was written by one John Rowland, who since hath replied upon him. I never read a word either of the first book or of the reply in my life" (Todd, I. 85, note).

We left Salmasius at Leyden in Feb. 1652–3, still intent on that answer of his own to Milton which he meant to supersede all others, if only he should ever manage to get it done, but dreadfully out of health, and much worried also by the feud which had broken out between Madame Salmasius and Morus in the Bontia business, and by all the publicity of that affair, including the lawsuit. From February to July we are to suppose the lawsuit going on, the ill-health continuing, and the Answer to Milton very much where it was. From July onwards all that remains to be told about Salmasius in this world may be told in the words of his biographer. "With "a fleeting and hurrying pen," says Clementius, "let us go "through the last act of our great hero's life, not to ex-"cruciate ourselves long with the thoughts of a matter all too "melancholy. His wife, then, not being very well, and "thinking to go to Spa or Liège, got him, without much "reluctance, to accompany her about the end of July 1653, "the extremely pleasant and mild weather at that time of the "year being a great inducement. Stopping one or two days "at Maestricht, he paid his respects to the most serene Count "of the Rhine, and was received by him in the friendliest "way, with much conversation to and fro, especially on "political matters; after which, as his wife was in haste, he "performed the rest of the journey. While he was at Spa, "to beguile the time, he buckled himself to his task of

---

[1] Thurloe Papers, Vol. IX. Rawl. A. 9, in the Bodleian. The news-letter is dated "Ratisbon the 18th of December 1653."

"confuting Milton, and that without books, and with the "assistance of his memory only, being a living library to "himself, and carrying his own Museum with him. He had "got through some [additional?] chapters, when his customary malady, the gout, accompanied on this occasion with "something of fever, forced him to break off. Afterwards, "feeling himself better, he returned at intervals, for two or "three days at a time, to the labour. Then, his illness "getting worse, he sent for one of the Spa physicians, and "wanted to be bled. The physician decidedly opposed this, "and insisted on other medical treatment. The disease getting "worse, another doctor was brought from Maestricht. The "two then prescribed purgatives, though he himself steadily "maintained that bleeding was what he had always been "accustomed to in this familiar ailment of his, and that it "was generally successful. Having taken the medicine,—it "was a little powder, — Salmasius became worse; then a "draught was administered, and after that our hero tended "to the worse still more and more. The Maestricht physician, obliged to take his departure next day, left I know "not what necessary and important directions. Meanwhile "Salmasius felt death approaching, and turned all his thoughts "that way. As he fortunately had the benefit at that time "of the society of the learned and Reverend Dr. Stuart, he "began to have frequent talks with him on theological and "other subjects, by this means to solace and feed his pious soul "in the midst of his pains. The distinguished A. Castro, also, "Senator of Hertogenwald, who had gone to Spa at the same "time for his health, was several times with the dying man. "Having been asked by Dr. Stuart whether in all things he "assented to the faith of the Reformed Church, he assented "entirely, and showed himself ready to sign the Articles thereof "with his own hand, signifying that he had never preferred any "other, and that, having embraced it in his childhood, he had "by God's blessing kept it steadily to that time, knowing it "to be true by the most certain and irreversible arguments, and "having asserted the same in published writings. He declared any imputation of Socinianism, or of having favoured "it in any way, or any other imputation of heterodoxy of any "kind that had been made by ill-natured people, to be mere "calumny, but that he forgave all that from his heart, and "had God as a witness for his own sincerity. Then, that he "might fulfil as far as possible the duty of a true Christian in "every respect, he enjoined on his wife that she should commit "to the flames, all and sundry, those already finished writings "of his against men of the highest mark which she had at "home, laid up in a certain cabinet, and ready for the press,— "in case, chancing to come into strange hands, they should "burst into public view, and ruin the reputation of great "men, whose very serious errors he had there confuted. All "this over, the brave soldier of Christ thought only of God "and Heaven, and he who had so often by the help of God "triumphed over the enemies of the truth bent all his "anxiety on the conquest of the last enemy, even death. And "so, having often implored the divine aid, and repeated his "prayers and sighs to the Saviour, he at last rendered up his "pious soul to God, on the 3rd day of September, 1653, about "nine o'clock, amid the tears and sobbings of the by-standers, "many Roman Catholic priests being present, who had been "drawn thither by a desire to see him, as if God himself had "designed that those whom he had found his bitterest enemies "through his whole life should now be witnesses of this "glorious act of his constancy in the true religion. Thus lived, "thus died, the chief of men, and true prince of the learned. "His body was the next day carried to Maestricht, and was "buried there in the principal church."[1]

Heinsius, who had now returned from Italy, was in Amsterdam when he received the news that his life-long enemy was no more; and *his* commemoration of the fact may come as a pendent to the foregoing. "The great Pan (*Magnus ille* "*Pan*)," wrote Heinsius from Amsterdam to Gronovius at Deventer, Sept. 16, 1653, "has gone the way of all flesh. "Some say that he died at Spa, some at Aix: 'tis certain "he is buried at Maestricht. No wonder that he who so

---

[1] *Vita Salmasii* by Antonius Clementius (1656) pp. LIII—LIV.

"much delighted in fighting should want to be buried in "a warlike place. I confess I do not myself take the event "greatly to heart, not that I feared the toothless threats of "the man, but that I love peace of mind above all things, and "he had left me, properly and continuously, none of that "commodity. Besides, he was at a time of life when nothing "solid or learned could be hoped from him more. Not even "to literature therefore is his death to be considered as a great "loss. But enough of this; for I will not imitate MORUS, "whom we have just seen exulting in the news. He had "won his suit against Xanthippe in the Synod of Utrecht, "and he believes that his adversary was shattered by that "intelligence, and could not survive."[1]

Milton also, in Petty France, Westminster, heard of his great adversary's death. With what thoughts will appear in due time. Meanwhile it will have been noted that the unfinished Answer to Milton was not one of those writings of Salmasius which the dying man had instructed his widow to burn. Milton, therefore, might expect to hear of it, and probably knew as much. At all events, there was the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor*, still waiting some attention; and, if SALMASIUS was dead, MORUS was alive. Through the last months of the Barebones Parliament the book that was taking shape in blind Milton's mind was one that should do for Morus what the former one had done for Salmasius, and a thousand times worse than that; and it was with this book growing in his thoughts that he passed out of the period of Cromwell's Interim Dictatorship into that of the Protectorate.

---

[1] Burmanni Syll. Epist. III. 323–324.

CHAPTER III.

FIRST NINE MONTHS OF OLIVER'S FIRST PROTECTORATE: DEC. 16, 1653—SEPT. 3, 1654.

CROMWELL'S CHANGE OF TITLE: CONSTITUTION OF THE PROTECTORATE BY THE INSTRUMENT CALLED *THE GOVERNMENT OF THE COMMONWEALTH*: POWERS OF THE LORD PROTECTOR: HIS COUNCIL: PROVISION FOR FUTURE PARLIAMENTS: LIST OF OLIVER'S COUNCIL: OFFICERS OF THE COUNCIL AND FORMS OF ITS MEETINGS.—OPPONENTS OF THE PROTECTORATE: ANABAPTIST DISCONTENTS AND STUARTIST PLOTS: LETTER OF ROGER WILLIAMS AROUT HARRISON, VANE, AND OTHERS: THE GERARD-VOWEL CONSPIRACY: RECEPTION OF THE PROTECTORATE IN IRELAND AND IN SCOTLAND: LUDLOW'S DISSENT IN IRELAND: RETURN OF MONK TO SCOTLAND: WAVERING OF COLONEL OVERTON: PEACE WITH THE UNITED PROVINCES: TREATIES WITH SWEDEN, PORTUGAL, DENMARK, FRANCE, AND SPAIN: OLIVER'S IMPRESSIVE STYLE WITH FOREIGN POWERS: THE DE BAAS INCIDENT AND THE CASE OF DON PANTALEON SA: LEGISLATIVE ENERGY OF THE PROTECTOR AND HIS COUNCIL: LIST OF THEIR FIRST ORDINANCES: THE PROTECTORATE AVOWEDLY FROM THE FIRST A CREATION IN THE INTERESTS OF CONSERVATISM, AND ESPECIALLY FOR THE CONSERVATION OF AN ESTABLISHED CHURCH AND THE UNIVERSITIES: FARTHER PROOFS OF THIS: AN ESTABLISHED CHURCH AND TOLERATION OUT OF IT THE TWO FIXED-IDEAS OF CROMWELL IN HIS PROTECTORATE: THE ORDINANCE FOR

A COMMISSION OF TRIERS AND THAT FOR A COMMISSION OF EJECTORS: THE LORD PROTECTOR AT HOME: CEREMONIAL OF HIS COURT.

FROM Dec. 16, 1653, Cromwell ceased to be merely "His Excellency the Lord General," and became "His Highness the Lord Protector," signing himself in all letters and public documents no longer "OLIVER CROMWELL," but "OLIVER, P."

The powers and duties of the Protectorate had been defined, rather elaborately, in a Constitutional Instrument of forty-two Articles, called *The Government of the Commonwealth*, to which Cromwell had sworn fidelity at his installation. The essence of this document was that the Head and Chief Dignitary of the Commonwealth should be the Lord Protector, that the Supreme Legislative Authority should reside in the Lord Protector and the People assembled in Parliament, and that the Chief Magistracy or Administrative Power, together with a certain Legislative Power when Parliament was not sitting, should be in the Lord Protector assisted by a Council. The powers of the LORD PROTECTOR by himself, therefore, and the nature of his relations, in the first place, to THE COUNCIL, and, in the second place, to coming PARLIAMENTS, were the all-important matters. They were prefigured as far as possible in the Instrument:—I. THE LORD PROTECTOR. Oliver Cromwell was to be Lord Protector for life, but the Protectorship was to be elective, and not hereditary. The election, after Cromwell's death, was to be with the Council, but all of the line of Stuart were to be for ever excluded. All writs, commissions, &c., were to be in the name of the Lord Protector; all the lands, rents, royalties, &c., of the Commonwealth, not otherwise disposed of, were to be vested in him and his successors; he was to be the fountain of all magistracy and honours; and he was to have the power of pardon, except in cases of murder and treason. For the rest, he was to govern "in all things by the advice of the Council, and according to these presents [the Articles of the Instrument] and the Laws." II. THE COUNCIL. This was to consist of *fifteen* persons named and appointed by the Instrument itself, together with as many more, not exceeding *six*, as the Lord Protector and the major part of the fifteen might think fit to add before the meeting of the first Parliament. The members of Council were not to be removeable by the Protector, nor removeable at all except on the ground of corruption or miscarriage after proof by a carefully guarded process; and, if any Councillor were so condemned, the Protector was to have no power to pardon him or continue him in office. Seven members of Council were to be a quorum for ordinary business, the proportion to be raised by the Protector and Council on any increase of the total number. The opinion of the major part of the Council present at any meeting was to be taken as the opinion of the Council. In case of a vacancy in the Council, by death or otherwise, Parliament was to nominate six persons for it, out of whom the Council were to choose two, referring these to the Protector for his final choice of one. III. PARLIAMENTS:—The first Parliament of the Protectorate was to meet on the 3rd of September 1654, and there were to be regular Triennial Parliaments afterwards, each to sit for five months at least before it could be dissolved, prorogued, or adjourned, without its own consent. There might be extraordinary Parliaments, to be called by the Protector with the advice of his Council. Each Parliament was to consist of not more than 460 persons; of whom thirty were to be from Scotland and thirty from Ireland, to be returned by such constituencies there as the Protector and his Council might determine, while the 400 or so from the counties, cities, and boroughs of England and Wales were to be after a definite schedule of distribution, included in the Instrument—which schedule was substantially a reproduction of Ireton's old Scheme of a Representative as that had been amended by the Rump. All persons who had been engaged in war against the Parliament since Jan. 1641–2, except such as had given signal testimony since then of their good affection, were to be disabled from electing or being elected for the first Parliament and the three next; and all concerned in the Irish Rebellion, and all Roman Catholics, were to be disabled for ever. Within these limits, any person over the age of twenty-one years, and "of known integrity, fearing God, and of good conversation,' was to be eligible, and all persons having real or personal estate worth £200 were to be electors. Sixty members of Parliament were to be a quorum. All Bills, after passing Parliament, were to be submitted to the Lord Protector for his assent, but were to become law without his assent, if the Parliament chose, and the Bills themselves were not in violation of the Constitutional Instrument, after twenty days had elapsed.[1]

Besides details as to the mode of conducting elections of Parliament, and the means to be taken for ensuring the meeting of a Parliament once every three years if the Lord Protector should neglect to issue writs, the Instrument laid down a few additional regulations of a fundamental nature. The Christian Religion was to be the Public Religion of the Commonwealth, and there was to be an Established Church or State-paid Ministry; but none were to be compelled by penalties to any religious act or profession, and all professing "faith in God by Jesus Christ" were to have liberty and protection in the exercise of their own ministry and worship apart from the Established Church, so long as these were not abused to the disturbance of the peace, or in favour of Popery or Prelacy.[2]

Next after the Lord Protector, it will be seen, the most visible power at the centre was the Council of State. It was not, like previous Councils, a shifting body, to be changed, in whole or in part, every year or every six months, but a permanent body, a small aristocracy of persons already chosen *ad vitam aut culpam* for their past merits or their supposed fitness, and placed round the Protector, independently of him, and so that their advice, and the assent of the major part of them, should be necessary to every measure. As the salary of each Councillor was to be £1000 a year (worth about £3500 now), it was no small thing, even in that consideration, to be one of those oligarchs. Cromwell, there is no doubt, had seen that the original fifteen nominated in the Instrument were men sufficiently to his mind; and the discretion left to himself and the major part of the fifteen to add a few more within a given time was not without use. At all events, whether because the persons had been so carefully chosen, or because devotion to Cromwell was necessarily from the first the very breath and life of the body, certain it is that it was not with the Council that the Protector was to have his difficulties. Cromwell and the Council were practically one, the persistent and unflinching core of the Commonwealth, through his whole Protectorate; and it is because they accepted Cromwell so thoroughly for their head, and made themselves so willingly his advisers only and the agents of his will, that History is now apt to forget what important men they were in the eyes of their contemporaries. Here are their names, the three put last being those of persons added within the time allowed, bringing the entire number of the Council up to eighteen:—

---

[1] Instrument of the First Protectorate, as given in full in *Parl. Hist.* III. 1417—1426.

[2] Ibid.

Henry Lawrence, Esq.
Lord Viscount Lisle.
Lieutenant-General Fleetwood.
Major-General Lambert.
Major-General Desborough.
Major-General Skippon.
Colonel Philip Jones.
Colonel Edward Montague.
Colonel William Sydenham.
Sir Gilbert Pickering, Bart.
Sir Charles Wolseley, Bart.
Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, Bart.
Francis Rous, Esq.
Walter Strickland, Esq.
Richard Mayor, Esq.
Colonel Humphrey Mackworth (Feb. 7, 1653–4. He died Dec. 1654, and was buried in Westminster Abbey).
Nathaniel Fiennes, Esq. (April 27, 1654).
Edmund Sheffield, Earl of Mulgrave (June 30, 1654).[1]

A word or two as to the general arrangements and habits of this Council of Eighteen:—At the first meeting, held on Friday, Dec. 16, 1653, the day of Cromwell's Installation, all the members present were sworn in, and the main business was drafting a Proclamation of the new Protectorate. At the next meeting, Henry Lawrence was appointed Chairman for a month; but he became, by a subsequent order of his Highness, permanent Chairman, with the title of "Lord President of the Council."[2] Thurloe was at once fixed in the chief Secretaryship, with a place at the Council Board, "being thereunto called by the Council" (Dec. 22); Mr. William Jessop and Mr. Henry Scobell were sworn in as Assistant-Secretaries (Jan. 6, 1653–4); while Mr. Gualter Frost remained in the employment of the Council, but in the new financial post of "Treasurer for the Council's contingencies." Milton was continued in office, on the tacit understanding, I should suppose, that he was now Latin Secretary Extraordinary; but Mr. Philip Meadows, originally brought in as Milton's Assistant, is now expressly styled "Latin Secretary" too, in recognition of his increased importance. There were seven under-clerks on Thurloe's staff, besides the other officers of the Council. The arrangement was that the Council should sit from nine to not later than one o' clock every Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, but both forenoon and afternoon on Friday, not sitting at all on Saturdays, unless on special order. There was to be a fine of 2*s*. 6*d*., to go to the poor, for every non-appearance at the hour of meeting without sufficient excuse, and Mr. Jessop was to see to the collection of the half-crowns. Cromwell, I may add, did not attend the Council at every meeting, or even habitually, but only pretty frequently. As all orders had to be approved by him, however, before they could take effect, orders passed in his absence were either sent to him for his approval, or were approved by him when he next came. The personal presence of "His Highness the Lord Protector" at any meeting is always carefully noted in the minutes—at the beginning if he had been present from the first, or on the margin at the point where he came in; and his approvals of the orders are also noted. There is not unfrequent evidence in the minutes of changes in the wording of Orders by suggestion from his

---

[1] Instrument of Protectorate, as above; Godwin, IV. 22—33.

[2] Lawrence was then about fifty-three years of age. He had been educated at Cambridge, had been abroad, and was regarded as a man of some speculative

---

and scholarly ability, having written two books, one called *Of Baptism* and the other *On our War and Communion with Angels.* He had been Cromwell's landlord in former days, the house and farm at St. Ives which Cromwell had occupied from 1631 to 1636 having been rented by him from Lawrence. These particulars are from a note by Bliss in Wood's Ath. IV. 63—64; where it is added: "CROMWELL, the Protector, was "first cousin to WALLER the poet, who "was second cousin to LAURENCE the "President, who was cousin to SIR "GILBERT PICKERING . . . , who was "brother-in-law to MONTAGUE." Add that FLEETWOOD was Cromwell's son-in-law, that DESBOROUGH was his brother-in-law, and MAYOR the father-in-law of his son Richard; and we have at least *six* of the Council personally related to the Protector.

Highness after he had seen them. The Lord President Lawrence or other individual members, and also Mr. Secretary Thurloe, went between his Highness and the Council as much as might be necessary; and Mr. Jessop often took papers to him.[1]

For the first nine months of the Protectorate the Government was managed by the Lord Protector and his Council without any Parliament, under those provisions of the Constitutional Instrument which entrusted to them not only the chief magistracy and administration, but also the raising of moneys till the first Parliament should meet, and generally the power of making necessary Laws and Ordinances during the abeyance of Parliament.

Measures for the preservation of the Public Peace were among the first cares of the Protector and the Council. The danger was from two opposite quarters. There were the stern implacable Democrats, both of the Army and of the civil community, who regarded the Protectorate, or any form of Single-Person Government, as a lapse from the true Republican faith, and Cromwell as an unpardonable apostate from that faith, against whom and his abettors any uprising would be lawful; and there were the Stuartists or Legitimists, amazed and alarmed by the elevation of Cromwell at last to an actual kind of throne, and finding comfort only in the thought of his greater exposure thereby to dagger or pistol-shot.

The zealots for outraged Republicanism were first astir, and chiefly the relics of the old Levellers or Lilburnians in London. Cromwell was denounced in their clubs and meetings. Especially, on the Sunday after his installation, two popular Anabaptist preachers, Christopher Feak and Vavasour Powell, had used the most reckless language about him in their sermons, one of them calling him "the dissemblingest perjured villain in the world," and bidding any one present repeat the phrase to him, and tell him moreover that his reign would be short. Such phrases, dispersed among the London populace, by whom at any rate the Proclamation of the Protectorate (Dec. 19) had been received doubtingly or gloomily, boded a possible outbreak, and the police of the Council had to be on the alert. Feak and Powell were arrested and brought before the Council on the 21st of December; and, though they were discharged on the 24th, Feak was again arrested in January, with another preacher, named Simpson, and the two were kept in prison. As the London Anabaptists and Sectaries generally of the more enthusiastic sorts were suspected of conspiring, Harrison, who was a great man among them, and whom Cromwell, after vainly trying to conciliate him and retain his services, had deprived of his commission, was ordered into his native Staffordshire, to prevent *his* leadership among the malcontents. Thus, gradually, by February 1653–4, the Anabaptist-Republican excitement in London was calmed down, and the more easily because it appeared that among the Baptists and enthusiastic sects themselves there were many who retained all their old faith in Cromwell, or were more reconcileable to his changed title than Harrison.

---

[1] Council Order Books for Dec. 1653 and generally.

Roger Williams left England on his return to America, it will be remembered, just after the establishment of the Protectorate. He had remained long enough, it appears, to witness the Anabaptist outbreak against Cromwell, and to form an opinion of it. There is some interest, therefore, in *his* representation of the affair, as he took it across the Atlantic with him, by way of the last news from England. "All the people of God in England," was his report, "formerly called *Puritanus Anglicanus*, of late *Roundheads*, now "*The Sectaries* (as more or less cast off from the parishes), are "now in the saddle and at the helm, so high that *non datur* "*descensus nisi cadendo.* Some cheer their spirits with the "impossibility of another fall or turn. So doth Major-General "Harrison, and Mr. Feak, and Mr. John Simpson, now in "Windsor Castle for preaching against the late change and "against the Protector as an usurper, Richard III., &c. So "did many think of the last [Barebones] Parliament, who "were of the vote of fifty-six against priests and tithes, opposite to the vote of fifty-four who were for them, at least for a "while. Major-General Harrison was the second in the "nation of late, when the loving General and himself joined "against the former Long Parliament and dissolved them; "but now, being the head of the fifty-six party, he was confined by the Protector and Council within five miles of his "father's house in Staffordshire. That sentence he not obeying, he told me the day before my leaving London he was "to be sent prisoner into Herefordshire. Surely, Sir, he is a "very gallant, most deserving, heavenly man, but most "high-flown for the Kingdom of the Saints, and the Fifth "Monarchy now risen, and their sun never to set again, &c. "Others—as, to my knowledge, the Protector, Lord President "Lawrence, and others at helm, with Sir Harry Vane (returned into Lincolnshire, yet daily missed, and courted for "his assistance)—are not so full of that faith of miracles, but "still imagine changes and persecutions, and the very "slaughter of the witnesses, before that glorious morning, so "much desired, of a worldly kingdom, if ever such a kingdom (as literally it is by many expounded) be to arise in "this world and dispensation."[1] This, though rapidly and quaintly expressed, goes far deeper, we shall find, into the real cause and origin of the Protectorate, and the real objection to it on the part of Harrison and kindred spirits, than the stereotyped accounts of ordinary histories. It shows also that Cromwell did not despair of yet reconciling some of the best men of that Republican sect, and was disposed to be lenient with *them* meanwhile in their first bursts of rage against himself.

Then, however, came the plots of the Stuartists. There were two such in succession, both turning on a projected assassination of Cromwell. The first, which seems to have been a wild and incoherent affair, was baffled on the 18th of February by the arrest of eleven persons in a tavern in the

---

[1] Letter of Roger Williams to Winthrop, of date July 12, 1654, already quoted ante pp. 531—533.

Old Bailey. They were sent to the Tower for a while, rather for custody than for trial; and not much was made of the matter. But the next Royalist plot was more serious. It was based on a secret proclamation (for that name, though odd, exactly describes the document) in the name of Charles II. himself, dated at Paris, May 3, 1654, N. S. (i. e. April 23 in English reckoning), and drawn up, it was believed, by Hyde. "Whereas it is apparent to all rational and unbiassed men "throughout the world," says the document, "that a certain "mechanic fellow, by name Oliver Cromwell, hath," &c., "these are therefore in our name to give free leave and liberty "to any man whomsoever, within any of our three kingdoms, "by pistol, sword, or poison, or by any other way or means "whatsoever, to destroy the life of the said Oliver Cromwell." A pension of £500 a year and the honour of knighthood were promised to the successful assassin "on the word and faith of a Christian King," with a Colonelcy if the assassin were a soldier. This proclamation was being circulated secretly among likely persons, when a certain John Gerard, a young English Royalist of good family, who had been at the Court of Charles in Paris, arrived in England direct from that Court. He had been a week or two in England when, on the morning of Saturday, the 20th of May, Mr. Secretary Thurloe, through one of his many channels of information, was warned of a plot to assassinate the Protector, either that afternoon on his way to Hampton Court, or next day in Chapel. Cromwell altered his route to Hampton Court that day; and before morning Gerard and four others were arrested. More arrests of Royalists followed, to the number of about forty in all; and the inquiry left no doubt that there had been a pretty widely ramified conspiracy to throw London into an uproar over the dead bodies of the Protector and one or two of his leading councillors, proclaim Charles II., and then hold the city till Prince Rupert arrived with a force from abroad. Only three of the conspirators, however, were brought to trial; and of these only Gerard himself, and an Islington Schoolmaster, named Peter Vowel, were brought to the scaffold. This was on July 10, and by that time the allegiance of London and of England generally to the Protectorate was pretty safe.[1]

The perturbation, however, had reached Scotland and Ireland.—In Ireland, where even Fleetwood was perplexed for a moment by his father-in-law's assumption of the sovereignty, and where Ludlow, a more obstinate Republican, had no doubt whatever on the subject, the proclamation of the Protectorate had been delayed for some time, and only ordered at last (Jan. 1653–4) by a casting vote in the Dublin Council, against which Ludlow protested, and after which he withdrew from all share in the civil government. The arrival of Henry Cromwell on a mission from his father did much to compose matters. He was in Dublin on the 4th of March, and he remained there about three weeks, received with great demonstrations of cordiality, and making a very agreeable impression on all. It was even rumoured and hoped that "my Lord Henry," as he was now called, had brought a commission in his pocket to supersede Fleetwood. That was not the case. It was enough that he had delivered his father's messages to all concerned, satisfied most of them by personal explanations, and overcome wavering in Fleetwood. Though remaining at his post in Ireland, Fleetwood, it must be remembered, had the honour of being nominally one of the Council in London.[2]—In Scotland the Proclamation of the Protectorate had been purposely delayed till it should be accompanied by some certainty as to the nature and details of that formal union of Scotland with the Commonwealth which had been left in discussion. There was reason to believe, however, that Colonel Robert Lilburne, the Commander-in-Chief in Scotland, and some of the other officers there, particularly Colonels Overton, Okey, and Alured, were very uneasy in their Republican consciences as to their duty in the new state of things, and disposed on the whole to the view of Harrison and Ludlow. To prevent possible consequences in the English army in Scotland, and also to deal more efficiently than Lilburne had done with the Royalist commotion in the Highlands, still maintained by Glencairn and others, Monk was sent back to his old command-in-chief. He arrived in Edinburgh about the end of April, proclaimed the Protectorate there with great state, sent Overton to command in Hull and Alured to Ireland for certain forces he wanted thence, and then marched into the Highlands for his main work. Middleton having meanwhile arrived, as regular general for Charles II., to take charge of the Highland revolt, appearances were really formidable. But Monk was more than their match, and he had an able second in Colonel Morgan. After marching hither and thither, fighting, chasing, and negotiating, he was back in Edinburgh in the end of August 1654, with the insurrection tramped out, Glencairn and other Highland chiefs bound by a capitulation, and Middleton a beaten fugitive once more to the continent. By this time Overton, who had been summoned from Hull to London, had sufficiently satisfied Cromwell. He returned, therefore, to Scotland in September, to be Monk's next in command. Some of the other suspected officers had been less fortunate. Alured, sent home from Ireland by Cromwell's order, had been deprived of his commission, and Okey had been recalled to England.[1]

---

[1] Thurloe, I. 641, II. 248—249; Council Order Books; Godwin, IV. 58—62 and 73—79; Carlyle, III. 3—5 and 12—15.

[2] Ludlow, 481—487; Thurloe, II. 162—164; Godwin, IV. 62—64.

Monk's success in Scotland would itself have been a considerable item to the credit of the Protectorate, and would have strengthened Cromwell's power. But by that time a series of successes of a different kind, won by Cromwell himself and the Council in London, had invested the Protectorate with such European dignity that dissent at home had been abashed, and its mutterings drowned in general applause.

On the 5th of April there had been signed in London, and on the 27th of April there had been proclaimed, a Treaty with the United Ppovinces, putting an end to the Dutch War at last, and on terms most advantageous to the Commonwealth. The two Republics, indeed, were not absolutely to coalesce into one European power, as had been originally proposed on the English side; but there was to be "a close and intimate friendship, affinity, confederacy, and union" between them, with ample concessions by the Dutch of the points in dispute, consent to the payment of outstanding damages, and promise of the exclusion from Dutch territory of Stuartists and other enemies of the Protectorate. On one provision of the Treaty, indeed, on which Cromwell had insisted as essential, there was much debate after it had received the signatures of the Dutch ambassadors in London. Cromwell had demanded that the Stadtholderate, which had been in abeyance since the death of William II. of Orange in 1650, should never be revived in favour of his infant son (afterwards William III. of England), and that no place of great power or eminence in the United Provinces should ever be bestowed on that prince. His plea was that the last Stadtholder, the son-in-law of Charles I., had, by his staunchness to the cause of Charles II. and the Stuarts, originated all the mischief between the two Republics hitherto, and that the disposition to intrigue for the Stuarts would run in the family. The States-General, however, passionately anxious though they were for peace, could not commit themselves to such a hard condition, and refused to ratify it. Cromwell then waived it, as regarded the States-General, but demanded that the Provincial States of Holland should make an equivalent engagement privately for themselves. Those States would fain have escaped too, but they were obliged to yield. And so, details of the money-indemnity on various scores having meanwhile been settled, all trouble was over. The Treaty was fast and sure in August 1654.—On the 28th of April there had been signed at Upsal a TREATY WITH SWEDEN, establishing free commerce between that kingdom and the Commonwealth, and also pledging Sweden to a real political alliance. Whitlocke, it will be remembered, had gone to Sweden on the business of this Treaty, in the preceding November, as Ambassador Extraordinary for the Barebones Parliament. He had already arrived, and begun his negotiations with Queen Christina and Oxenstiern, when the news of the resignation of that Parliament and of the establishment of the Protectorate followed him. But, his credentials having been renewed by the Protector, and he himself having signified his cordial adherence to the new Government, and Queen Christina having expressed her satisfaction with the change and her great admiration of Cromwell personally, the negotiation had gone on. There had been difficulties, indeed, requiring much effort on Whitlocke's part and fresh instructions from home; but these had been removed by the Peace with the Dutch, and all had ended happily. It is memorable that this Treaty between Sweden and Cromwell was one of the last acts of Queen Christina's reign. She had been talking of abdicating for some time; and on the 16th of June, 1654, she did abdicate, though only twenty-eight years of age, in favour of her cousin Charles X. As this prince, however, had been earnest for the Treaty while it was in progress, the change of rule made no difference. Whitlocke had left Sweden before it took place; and on the 6th of July he was in London, making his report to the Lord Protector and the Council, and receiving their thanks and congratulations. How much had occurred during his eight months of absence!—Following the Treaties with the United Provinces and Sweden there was a TREATY WITH PORTUGAL, putting an end at last to the irritating relations with that country since the beginning of the Commonwealth. The preliminaries of the Treaty had been arranged between the Rump Parliament, just before its dissolution, and the Portuguese Ambassador, Count Sa; but the definite conclusion had not been reached till now. Portugal conceded everything, including a large money-indemnity for the damages she had allowed Prince Rupert to inflict on English commerce in her ports in the early days of the Commonwealth. The Treaty was signed on the 10th of July.—A special TREATY WITH DENMARK, opening the Sound to English commerce on the same terms as to the Dutch, was ready for signature, though it was not actually signed till Sept. 14. Such a settlement with Denmark, indeed, was but a corollary of the Treaty with the Dutch.—Meanwhile FRANCE and SPAIN had been running a race for the favour of the great Lord Protector. M. de Bordeaux, agent for France in London since Dec. 1652, was raised by Mazarin, in Feb. 1653–4, to the rank of full ambassador, with instructions to sustain that rank with splendour; and at the same time a M. de Baas was sent by Mazarin to London as a confidential messenger to Cromwell, and to assist Bordeaux. The offers made for an alliance with the Protector against Spain were superb. The French king would pay 1,800,000 livres a year, restore Dunkirk to the English, exclude the two elder Stuarts from France, &c.; and Mazarin wanted M. de Bordeaux and M. de Baas to inform him privately whether *M. le Protecteur* liked Barbary horses, or whether it would be too great a familiarity to send him a present of wine. In competition with these offers, the Spanish Ambassador Cardenas bade as high as he could, even promising 600,000 crowns a year, though, as Mazarin said when he heard of it, he had not the first sou ready. Cromwell listened to both Powers, but did not yet declare himself. Only he had conveyed to both very distinctly that his demands would be higher than their offers, and would include liberty for Protestantism and Protestant worship in either country.[1]

---

[1] Thurloe, II. 18 and 414; Godwin, IV. 64—72; Life of Robert Blair, 314—318; Baillie, III. 252.

Two incidents in the course of these Treaties and negotiations with Foreign Powers added largely to that awe of Cromwell abroad which the general tenor and results of the correspondence with him were calculated to inspire.—One was his dismissal of M. de Baas. That agent of Mazarin, by instructions from Mazarin himself, had been playing a double part. At the same time that he was holding friendly conferences with Cromwell, he had been in secret traffic with some of those concerned in the Gerard-Vowel conspiracy, had been gauging the likelihoods of that conspiracy, and had even been inquiring after some man among the Army Republicans fit to head an independent movement against Cromwell with countenance from France and the help of French money. Nothing of this kind escaped Thurloe's police; and, one day early in June, M. de Baas, waiting on the Lord Protector and his Council by appointment, had been confronted with the proofs of his double-dealing, rebuked indignantly, and ordered out of England. It gave Mazarin a new idea of Cromwell's magnanimity that the affair had been allowed to end so, and that Cromwell had even written to himself and to Louis XIV. expressing a hope that such a wretched accident as the crime of M. de Baas and its exposure would not interrupt the negotiations already in progress.—Of a more tragic ending, and shooting through Europe a yet more vivid idea of the character of the man who now ruled in the British Islands, was the other and contemporary incident. It concerned Portugal immediately, but was a lesson for all Foreign Courts and Powers. As long ago as Nov. 22, 1653, or in the last days of the Barebones Parliament, there had been a scuffle or riot in the New Exchange in the Strand, brought about by the appearance there of Don Pantaleon Sa, the brother of the Portuguese Ambassador, at the head of about twenty Portuguese retainers of the Embassy, all flourishing their weapons. Don Pantaleon had quarrelled there the previous day with a young English gentleman—no other, as it chanced, than the Mr. Gerard who afterwards figured in chief in the Royalist plot for assassinating Cromwell; and, having been stopped then in fighting with the gentleman, he had returned for his revenge. Mr. Gerard was not there now; but an unfortunate Mr. Greenway, who looked like him, and was walking on the spot with two ladies, was shot dead instead, and four other Englishmen were wounded. The rioters had then taken refuge in the Portuguese Embassy, but had been dragged thence in spite of every plea of privilege, and confined in Newgate. A committee of the Council of State then in office had been appointed to ascertain the Law of Nations bearing on such a business, and Mr. Selden had been consulted; but the matter remained to be decided by the new authorities of the Protectorate. No intercession could prevail on Cromwell and his Council to treat the affair otherwise than as murder, or to exempt an Ambassador's brother from the ordinary course of law. While the Treaty with Portugal was being arranged with the Count Sa, his brother, Don Pantaleon Sa, was waiting his trial. He and four of his companions, three of them Portuguese, were tried July 6, before a mixed jury of Englishmen and foreigners, and sentenced to be hanged. The minor Portuguese culprits were reprieved; but all the favour that could be obtained for Don Pantaleon was the commutation of hanging into beheading. Actually, on July 10, his brother having signed the Portuguese Treaty with the Protector, and then left town, that same morning, Don Pantaleon was beheaded on Tower Hill. On the same block Gerard, whose fate had been so singularly interwoven with his, had been beheaded but an hour before.[1]

---

[1] Thurloe, Vol. II. in various places; Whitlocke, IV. 115—120; Godwin, IV. 47—57 and 80—85; Guizot, II. 80—87, and Appendix of Documents (for France and Spain). The documents in the Appendix to M. Guizot's book are very instructive.

The Protector and his Council had not been allowing their *legislative* power to lie asleep. In the exercise of this power the Council seem to have copied as far as possible the forms of the House of Commons. Treating their ordinances as Bills, they read each ordinance twice, then referred it to a committee, then read it a third time, and then presented it to the Protector for his assent. Naturally, however, in a body of eighteen persons, of whom about twelve were usually present, the legislation, with all these formalities, was much faster than in any House of Commons. Between the beginning of the Protectorate in Dec. 1653 and the month of September 1654 no fewer than eighty-two ordinances of one kind or another were passed by the Protector and the Council. The following is a list of them—a dry-looking compilation perhaps, but which no reader should wholly skip who would study in the most authentic manner the soul and will of Oliver Cromwell in those months when he found himself for the first time the actual master of the British Islands. They are the edicts which, after consultation with his Council, he thought most immediately necessary in continuance or in correction of recent legislation by the Rump and the Barebones Parliament:—

---

[1] Thurloe, II. 309, 351—353, 379, 437; Guizot, II., Appendix of Documents, 412—421 (Letter of M. de Bordeaux, and Cromwell's own Letters to Louis XIV. and Mazarin); Whitlocke, IV. 120; Godwin, IV. 54; Council Order Book, Dec. 2 and Dec. 24, 1653; Chambers's Book of Days, II. 40—41 (Account of affair of Don Pantaleon Sa, from contemporary pamphlets, with a rough portrait of him).

ORDINANCES OF OLIVER AND HIS COUNCIL : *Dec.* 1653—*Sept.* 1654.

1. *Dec.* 24, 1653 :—Ordinance for continuing the Excise to March 25, 1654.

2. *Same day* :—Ordinance for continuing to Oct. 3, 1654, an Act of the Rump in 1650 for the Redemption of Captives.

3. *Same day* :—Ordinance for reviving, and continuing to Oct. 1, 1654, an Act of the Rump of April 1653, concerning Probate of Wills and Administrations.

4. *Dec.* 26 :—Ordinance for altering names and forms heretofore used in Law-Courts, Writs, Grants, Patents, &c., so as to bring them into accordance with the Protectoral Government.

5. *Dec.* 29 :—Ordinance appointing Commissioners for looking after arrears and collection of Excise.

6. *Dec.* 31 :—Ordinance continuing to Feb. 1, 1653–4, the powers of the Commissioners for compounding and of two other Commissions.

7. *Jan.* 19, 1653–4 :—Ordinance repealing the Act of the Rump of Jan. 2, 1649–50, requiring subscription to the Engagement of Allegiance to the Commonwealth, and quashing all procedure in the terms or spirit of that Act.

8. *Same day* :—Ordinance enumerating the offences to be thenceforth considered as High Treason.

9. *Jan.* 28 :—Ordinance appointing Committee for the Army, and Treasurers at war for the current six months' assessment.

10. *Feb.* 10 :—Ordinance appointing Commissioners for Estates of Delinquents and Recusants under Sequestration, and giving them powers.

11. *Feb.* 17 :—Ordinance modifying the way of levying the latter half of the six months' assessment of £120,000 a month for the Army and Navy, from Dec. 25, 1653 to June 24, 1654, voted by the Barebones Parliament.

12. *Same day* :—Ordinance explaining the former ordinance (No. 8) touching Treasons.

13. *Feb.* 28 :—Ordinance reviving the Privileges and Jurisdiction of the County Palatine of Lancaster, and appointing Matthew Hale and Hugh Wyndham Judges of Assize for said county.

14. *March* 17 :—Ordinance for continuing the Excise, as in ordinance No. 1, beyond the date there fixed.

15. *March* 20 :—Ordinance continuing till March 26, 1658, an Act of Parliament relating to the Customs.

*16. *Same day* :—Ordinance appointing a Commission for the Approbation of all Public Preachers and Lecturers before their admission to Benefices.

17. *Same day* :—Ordinance continuing to March 26, 1655, an Act of Parliament imposing a Tax on Coals for Navy purposes.

18. *Same day* :—Ordinance requiring that all orders for the custody of Idiots and Lunatics to be issued by the Commissioners

of the Great Seal shall be signed by his Highness the Lord Protector.

19. *Same day*:—Ordinance that Proceedings in cases of Murder in Ireland shall remain as heretofore.

20. *Same day*:—A private ordinance settling certain manors in Suffolk for the charitable uses for which they had been devised.

21. *March* 22:—Ordinance reviving, and continuing to Nov. 1, 1654, an Act for Pressing Seamen.

22. *March* 23:—Ordinance confirming all previous Acts or Ordinances for the Relief or Indemnity of persons who have acted in the public service.

23. *March* 31, 1654:—Ordinance suspending the Proceedings of Judges named in an Act for the Relief of Creditors and Poor Prisoners.

24. *Same day*:—Ordinance against Matches for Cock-fighting, because they "are by experience found to tend many times to the "disturbance of the public peace, and are commonly accompanied "with Gaming, Drinking, Swearing, Quarrelling, and other dissolute practices, to the dishonour of God, and do often produce "the ruin of persons and their families." All public assemblies for cock-fighting within England and Wales are to be suppressed.

25. *Same day*:—Ordinance, in thirteen Articles, for the amending, repairing, and keeping in order, of Common Highways over England and Wales.

26. *April* 3:—Ordinance continuing an Act for Probate of Wills and Administrations.

27. *April* 8:—Ordinance adjourning part of the Easter Term.

28. *April* 11:—Ordinance appointing Commissioners to execute an Act prohibiting the planting of Tobacco in England.

29. *April* 12:—Ordinance about Surveyors of High Roads chosen or to be chosen under No. 25.

30. *Same day*:—Ordinance of Pardon and Grace for the People of Scotland, as follows:—"His Highness the Lord Protector of the "Commonwealth of England, Scotland, and Ireland, and the Do-"minions thereunto belonging, being desirous that the mercies "which it hath pleased God to give to this nation, by the successes "of their forces in the late war in Scotland, should be improved for "the good and advantage of both nations, and the people of "Scotland made equal sharers with those of England in the present "settlement of Peace, Liberty, and Prosperity, with all other "privileges of a Free People, doth ordain and declare, and be it "ordained and declared by his Highness the Lord Protector, with the "consent of his Council,—That all persons of the Scottish nation, "of what degree or quality soever they or any of them are (except "the persons hereafter in this ordinance particularly excepted), "shall be and are hereby, from and after the First Day of May in "the year 1654, freed, acquitted, and discharged from all forfeit-"ures, pains, penalties, mulcts corporeal or pecuniary, restraints,

"imprisonment or imprisonments, punishment or punishments whatsoever (other than is hereafter in this ordinance expressed), "for any matter or thing by them or any of them committed or "done by sea or land in relation to the late War, or any preceding "Wars between the two Nations; And that for the matters aforesaid there shall be, from and after the said First Day of May "aforesaid, no sequestration, confiscation, fine, penalty, forfeiture, "or punishment, imposed or continued upon them or any of them "(otherwise than is hereafter in this ordinance expressed), but the "same shall be put in perpetual oblivion: And also that the "Estates and Personal of all persons of the Scotch Nation (except "as is hereafter in this ordinance excepted and provided) shall be "and are hereby and from thenceforth freed, discharged, and "acquitted from all sequestrations, confiscations, fines, penalties, "and forfeitures, whatsoever, for any matter or thing by them or "any of them committed or done in relation to the aforesaid Wars "between the two Nations."—The ordinance then goes on to specify the Exceptions. I. Henrietta Maria, Charles Stuart, and James Stuart are excepted from all benefit of the ordinance; and all properties or rights in Scotland belonging to them, or coming to them or to any of the late Royal line from the late King, are absolutely forfeited. II. There are also excepted the late James, Duke of Hamilton, and his brother and successor the late William, Duke of Hamilton, with the Earls of Lauderdale, Loudoun, Crawford-Lindsay, Callander, Marischal, Kelly, Seaforth, Athole, and Glencairn, Viscounts Kenmure and Newburgh, Lord Lorne (eldest son of the Marquis of Argyle), Lord Mauchline (eldest son of the Earl of Loudoun), Lord Montgomery (eldest son of the Earl of Eglinton), Lords Spynie, Cranston, Sinclair, Bargany, Napier, and Mordington: also John Middleton, late Lieutenant-General in the Scottish Army, Thomas Dalyell of Binns, late Major-General in the same, Sir Thomas Thomson, and the Laird of Womat. There is to be provision, however, on certain terms of submission, for the wives, widows, or daughters of some of the aforesaid noblemen and gentlemen out of their forfeited Estates,—e. g., £400 a year for each of the widowed Duchesses of Hamilton, £400 a year each for the Countesses of Crawford and Loudoun, £300 a year for the Countess of Lauderdale, £200 a year for the eldest daughter of Earl Marischal, and £150 a year for each of the three younger daughters of the same Earl. III. The following Fines are imposed on lesser Delinquents before they can have the benefit of the Ordinance, one half to be paid at Leith on or before Aug. 2, and the other half on or before Dec. 2, 1654:—£15,000 sterling on the Heirs of the late Francis, Earl of Buccleuch; £10,000 on the Earl of Panmure; £6000 each on the Earls of Roxburgh and Airlie; £5000 on the Earl of Perth and his son Lord Drummond, and the same on Lord Cochrane and on Sir Andrew Fletcher; £4000 each on the Earl of Queensberry, the Earl of Galloway, and Lieutenant-General David

Leslie; £3500 on the Earl of Moray; £3000 each on the Earl of Southesk, Lord Ross, Lord Cupar, Sir William Scott of Harden, Sir Francis Ruthven, and Scott of Montross; £2500 each on Lord Forester and Henry Maule (son of the Earl of Panmure); £2000 each on the Earl of Winton, the Earl of Erroll, the Earl of Hartfield, Sir John Wauchope of Niddry, Colquhoun of Luss, Hay of Bowsey, Arnott of Fernie, Scott of Thirlstane, Sir James Carmichael, Sir Patrick Cockburn, Sir George Morison of Prestongrange, and Murray of Stanhope; £1500 each on Sir John Scot of Scotstarvet, Sir Archibald Stirling of Carden, Sir James Livingston of Kilsyth, Murray of Polmaise, Viscount Dudhope, Preston of Craigmillar, the Earl of Findlater, the Earl of Tullibardine, Lord Duffus, Lord Gray, the Earl of Dalhousie, Lord Boyd, Lord Balvaird, and the Laird of Bachilton; £1000 each on the Marquis of Douglas and his eldest son Lord Angus, the Earl of Selkirk, the Earl of Buchan, Sir Henry Nisbet, the Laird of Lundie, Lord Semple, Lord Elphinston, Lord Rollo, the Earl of Kinghorn, the Earl of Kincardine, Lord Banff, Meldrum of Tullibody, Sir Robert Graham of Morphie, Hay of Naughton, Renton of Lamberton, Hamilton of Preston, Sir Robert Farquhar, Collairney the younger, the Laird of Gosford, Mercer of Aldie, the Earl of Rothes, Elliott of Stobbs, and Sir Lewis Stuart; 1000 marks on Philip Anstruther (son of Sir Robert Anstruther); and £500 each on Drummond of Mackensy and the Laird of Rothiemagordon.—Commissioners for investigating all claims upon the forfeited estates in Scotland, on behalf of the Lord Protector and his Government, were to be John Swinton of Swinton, Esq., William Lawrence, Esq., George Smith, Esq., Sir James Macdowell of Garthland, Samuel Desborough, Esq., and John Thompson, Esq., or any three of them.

31. *Same Day:*—Ordinance formally incorporating Scotland into one Commonwealth with England. It recites previous proceedings in that great business, and declares it now completed and perfected. Scotland is to send thirty representatives to all future Parliaments of the Commonwealth; Kingship and separate Parliamentary authority in Scotland are abolished; the Arms of Scotland, a St. Andrew's Cross, are to be received into the Arms of the Commonwealth, and the Arms of the Commonwealth so modified are to be used in Scotland; there is to be perfect reciprocity of trade between Scotland and England, and trade between Scotland and all English Dominions as free as between England herself and the same; taxes are to be proportionable; and servitudes, vassalages, lordships, &c., hitherto peculiar to Scotland are to cease.

32. *Same Day:*—Ordinance for erecting Courts-Baron in Scotland, like the Courts-Baron or Courts of Manor in England, each to settle within its district suits for not more than forty shillings.

33. *Same Day:*—Ordinance vesting the forfeited lands in Scotland, as by No. 30, in the following trustees:—Sir John Hope of

Craighall, William Lockhart the younger, Esq., Richard Saltonstal and Edward Siler (Commissioners at Leith), Lieutenant-Colonel Wilks (Deputy Governor of Leith), David Barclay, Esq., and John Harper, Esq.; with instructions to these Trustees as to the administration of the estates, payment of creditors and of the allowances to wives, widows, and children of the original owners, &c.

34. *April* 18 :—Ordinance further suspending proceedings of Judges under the Act for Relief of Creditors and Poor Prisoners.

35. *May* 4 :—Additional Excise Ordinance, modifying No. 14.

36. *Same Day:*—Ordinance for borrowing £20,000 more upon the confiscated Lands of Deans and Chapters in England and Wales.

37. *May* 16 :—Ordinance continuing No. 34 for another fortnight.

38. *Same Day:*—Ordinance empowering Commissioners for Justice in Scotland, as far as to May 12, 1655, to relax the strict rule of Law in cases of Debtors unable to pay their Debts.

39. *Same Day:*—Ordinance transferring the County Court of Cheshire to the City of Norwich during the Plague at Chester.

40. *Same Day:*—Ordinance explaining part of former Ordinance touching Highways (No. 25).

41. *May* 24 :—Ordinance empowering certain Commissioners appointed in connexion with the Treaty with the Dutch to administer an oath.

42. *May* 26 :—Ordinance for the Preservation of the Draining Works of the Great Level of the Fens of the Eastern Counties.

43. *June* 2 :—Ordinance explaining part of an Act of April 2, 1651, continuing the Court of Admiralty.

44. *June* 8 :—Ordinance imposing an assessment for the six months from June 24, 1654, at the rate of £120,000 a month for the first three months, and £90,000 for the last three.

45. *June* 9 :—Ordinance enabling the Judges of the Northern Circuit to hold Assizes and Gaol-deliveries at Durham.

46. *Same Day:*—Ordinance for borrowing £2000 more on the Lands of Deans and Chapters.

47. *Same Day:*—Ordinance altering and explaining Act for Relief of Creditors and Poor Prisoners.

48. *Same Day:*—Ordinance for Reviving the Court of the Duchy of Lancaster.

49. *June* 13 :—Ordinance Establishing a High Court of Justice for Trial of all offences mentioned in the Ordinance touching Treasons (Nos. 8 and 12).

50. *June* 21 :—Ordinance for bringing all the Public Revenues of the Commonwealth into one Treasury. Instead of "multiplicity of Treasuries and Receipts," as heretofore, the Public Exchequer at Westminster is to be the single Treasury, and is to be called "The Receipt of the Exchequer of His Highness the Lord Protector."

51. *Same Day:*—Ordinance modifying No. 13 by providing that

Judges of the Northern Circuit shall be Assize Judges in the County Palatine of Lancaster.

*52. *June* 23 :—Ordinance extending time allowed in No. 16 for the approbation of Public Preachers.

53. *Same Day:*—Ordinance limiting the number of persons keeping Hackney Coaches in London, Westminster, and six miles round, to 200, and vesting the control of them in the Court of Aldermen.

54. *Same Day:*—Ordinance for the Further Encouragement of the Adventurers for Lands in Ireland, and of the Soldiers and other Settlers planted there. Various advantages are offered to Protestant colonists in Ireland generally; and Preachers who will go into Ireland after approbation are to have an allowance for outfit and sure pay afterwards.

55. *June* 27 :—Ordinance determining the districts or constituencies in Scotland that are to return the thirty members from Scotland to future Parliaments of the Commonwealth.

56. *Same Day:*—Ditto for Ireland.

57. *Same Day:*—Ordinance for Indemnity to English Protestants in Munster who were led into wrong courses by Ormond and Lord Inchiquin.

58. *June* 29 :—Ordinance against Challenges, Duels, and all Provocations thereunto. Fighting a duel in which death shall ensue is to be adjudged murder.

59. *Same Day:*—Ordinance continuing the Committee for the Army and Treasurers at War, and providing that £40,000 a month of the first three months' assessment (as by No. 44), and £30,000 a month for the last three months, shall be for the use of the Navy.

60. *June* 30 :—Ordinance for empowering the Commissioners of Customs to punish the Drunkenness and Profane Cursing and Swearing which have become too common among the "carmen, "porters, watermen, and others, who are employed upon the "quays, as also upon the river Thames, in ships, boats, and lighters, "and in Thames-street, and other streets and lanes adjacent."

61. *July* 4 : — Ordinance prohibiting Horse-races for six months.

62. *Aug.* 1 :—Ordinance authorising a Committee of the Adventurers for Irish lands to determine differences among the Adventurers till July 5, 1655.

63. *Aug.* 11 :—Ordinance modifying former Ordinance for Relief of Creditors and Poor Prisoners (No. 47).

64. *Same Day:*—Ordinance for abating nuisances and encroachments in the Thames and Medway.

65. *Aug.* 21 :—Ordinance appointing Commissioners to survey the Forests, Honours, Manors, Lands, Tenements, &c., heretofore belonging to the late King, Queen, and Prince.

66. *Same Day:*—Ordinance for Reforming the High Court of

Chancery. It is a long and intricate Ordinance in sixty-seven Articles, limiting the jurisdiction of the Court, regulating its proceedings of all varieties, and fixing fees and charges of all kinds for the future.

*67. *Aug.* 29 :—Ordinance appointing Commissioners in all the Counties of England and Wales for ejecting scandalous, ignorant, and insufficient Ministers and Schoolmasters, and prescribing the modes of procedure of such Commissioners. The Ordinance is a very long one.

68. *Same Day:*—Ordinance fixing the Excise of Alum and Copperas at 3*d.* per cwt. from Sept. 29, 1654.

*69. *Aug.* 30:—Ordinance for taking an Account of the Moneys received upon the Act of Feb. 22, 1649–50, for the Better Propagation and Preaching of the Gospel in Wales.

70. *Same Day :*—Ordinance for the Sale of four Forests or Chases reserved for collateral security to the Soldiers.

*71. *Sept.* 2 :—Ordinance for the Better Maintenance and Encouragement of Preaching Ministers, and for Uniting and Severing of Parishes. Ten Trustees are named, who are for the future to manage the Church Revenues, superseding Trustees appointed by former Acts, and to have all necessary powers.

72. *Same Day:*—Ordinance enabling soldiers who have served the Commonwealth to set up and exercise any Trade without the usual apprenticeship, or with imperfect apprenticeship.

73. *Same Day :*—Ordinance letting out the Postage of Letters, inland and foreign, to John Manley, of London, Esq., for a certain rent and on certain conditions.

74. *Same Day :*—Ordinance relaxing a part of No. 25 so as to allow a greater number of horses or oxen than is there specified to be used for the cartage of millstones, timber, &c., during the four summer months.

75. *Same Day:*—Ordinance touching Fines on Writs of Covenant and Writs of Entry.

76. *Same Day:*—Ordinance for borrowing £5000 more on Deans' and Chapters' Lands.

77. *Same Day:*—Ordinance for admitting Protestants in Ireland who have been delinquents to compound.

78. *Same Day:*—Ordinance for bringing several branches of the Revenue heretofore separate under the management of the Commissioners for the Treasury and Court of Exchequer.

79. *Same Day :*—Ordinance reviving and continuing an Act of the 7th of King James "for the speedy recovery of many thousand "acres of marsh grounds and other grounds within the counties of "Norfolk and Suffolk, lately surrounded by the rage of the sea," and for preserving the same.

80. *Same Day:*—Ordinance for continuing the Charitable Foundation of the Poor Knights at Windsor, and other Foundations at Windsor formerly administered by the Dean and Canons there.

*81. *Same Day:*—Ordinance supplementary to No. 16. Clerical Delinquents who had been ejected from their benefices have, under colour of the Act of General Pardon and Oblivion of Feb. 24, 1651–2, been regaining possession of these benefices, or creeping into others, "without giving any satisfaction of their conformity or submission to the Government." The Commissioners for approbation of Public Preachers are to re-admit no such old sequestrated delinquents until His Highness and His Council are satisfied; and the number of said Commissioners is increased by five new persons.

*82. *Same Day:*—Ordinance appointing Visitors for the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and for Westminster School, Winchester School, Merchant Taylors' School, and Eton College and School[1].

Such a list indicates at least great legislative activity on the part of Cromwell and his Council. These eighty-two Ordinances alone, passed in eight months and a week (and there were a good many others not made so public),[2] showed a rate of legislative activity greatly exceeding that of the Barebones Parliament during its existence of five months, and exceeding also that of the Rump from 1649 to 1653, and perhaps that of the Long Parliament itself at its fullest swing, between 1642 and 1649. It is to be remembered, however, that the Protector and his Council inherited many measures already partly shaped by the Rump or the Barebones Parliament, only rapidly turning into Ordinances resolutions that had struggled through these Parliaments, and giving them a Cromwellian stamp, and perhaps now and then a Cromwellian turn. Also it is to be noted that not a few of the Ordinances were money

---

[1] Compiled from Scobell's *Acts and Ordinances* (1658), Part II. pp. 275—368.

[2] From subsequent pages in Scobell (pp. 390—392) it appears that the eighty-two Ordinances which he gives in full in black letter or in abbreviation on pp. 275—368 were only those which he found printed or deemed important, and that many others were passed by Cromwell and his Council which were less accessible. About fifty such are registered by Scobell himself in these subsequent pages, by their titles only, and without the exact dates, as "Ordinances not printed." Among them are some relating to persons,—e. g. Ordinances for donations of land or income to Monk, John Durie, Nicholas Lockyer, Hugh Peters, and others; but some are of public consequence. Among these last I note three—"Ordinance for setting up Lectures in Scotland," "Ordinance for allowing of Debts belonging to the University of Glasgow and the Revenues of the same," and "Ordinance for the better support of the Universities in Scotland and encouragement of Public Preachers there."

Ordinances, or Ordinances merely continuing or modifying former Acts.

Which were the more important of those substantial Ordinances that are now to be remembered as Cromwell's own, whether because they were of his suggestion or because they went forth first with "O. P." as their voucher, will have been clear enough already from the brief descriptions given. We must call express attention, however, to the seven Ordinances marked with an asterisk in the list: viz. Nos. 16, 52, 67, 69, 71, 81, and 82. All in all, they are the Ordinances most profoundly significant of the character and spirit of the Protectorate. They all relate to things spiritual and ecclesiastical; and, for practical purposes, all the seven are summed up in the two numbered 16 and 67, the others being but appendages to these. No. 16, passed March 20, 1653–4, is *An Ordinance for Commissioners to approve of Public Preachers presented to Benefices;* and No. 67, passed Aug. 29, 1654, is *An Ordinance for the Ejection of Scandalous and Insufficient Ministers and Schoolmasters.* The two together form one whole, which may be regarded as Cromwell's own scheme for the Maintenance and Propagation of the Gospel in England and Wales.

The more the facts are studied, the more clearly it appears that the Protectorate had come into existence not only in a Conservative interest generally, but very specially on the question of an Established Church. For a long while the paramount controversy among those who may be called the thinkers of the Commonwealth had been as to the lawfulness or expediency of such a Church, i. e. of a State-paid and State-recognised Ministry, in any form or to any extent whatsoever. There had been a powerful and massive combination for the defence, consisting not only of the Presbyterians, and of such adherents of the old Episcopacy as thought the theory of an Established Church worth contending for even in the dreadful abeyance of the right Episcopal model, but also of many of the most eminent Independent Divines, led by Owen, Nye, and Thomas Goodwin. Not the less had the principle of Absolute Voluntaryism been sinking deep in other minds, and expressing itself in proposals for the abolition at once and for ever of every semblance of an Established Church, on the ground that such abolition would be the noblest act yet remaining for the Commonwealth, and the perfection of Spiritual Liberty. Twice we have seen the controversy in Parliamentary debate. It appeared in the last year of the Rump in the long and anxious proceedings about the Propagation of the Gospel, both in the House itself and in the Committee for that subject, more especially in connexion with the proposals of Owen and other Ministers (ante pp. 387–395). Then, as we saw, there was some doubt among many which way Cromwell would go, and there were not wanting zealots for Voluntaryism who thought he might declare himself on their side, and save England from the disaster of even the comparatively liberal State-Church which Owen and his colleagues wanted to set up. Probably they misconstrued Cromwell even then, and ought to have known his opinions better. At all events, there is no sign but that Cromwell agreed thoroughly with the conclusions on the subject which were arrived at by the Rump in the last months of its existence; which conclusions were "That the Magistrate hath power, in matters of Religion, for the Propagation of the Gospel," and generally that the scheme of Owen and his colleagues was a feasible one. These conclusions, we may say, were handed on into the period of Cromwell's Interim Dictatorship and the Barebones Parliament; and what had happened then? Why, the Barebones Parliament, Cromwell's own convention of the most godly spirits of the country, had expired in a death-struggle over them (ante pp. 513–518). There was, as Roger Williams describes it, "the vote of fifty-six against priests and tithes, opposite to the vote of fifty-four who were for them, at least for a while." In other words, by a majority of two votes the House had rejected the first clause of a Report recommending the continuance of a State-paid Ministry, the continued exaction of Tithes for their support, and the appointment of a Commission for ejecting unfit ministers and appointing fit ones to vacant livings all over the country. Cromwell had left the House to its own freedom in the debate; but there can be no doubt that he regarded with alarm this rejection by a majority in his own select Parliament of a report affirming the Civil Magistrate's Power in matters of Religion, and that, when Rous, Sydenham, and the rest of the minority, refused to sit after such a revolutionary vote, and broke up the Parliament upon it, he approved of their act. The uniform testimony of the contemporary authorities is that there had come to be a powerful and enthusiastic party in the Barebones Parliament that were for laying the axe to the root of an Established Christian Ministry altogether, as a mere Babylonish institution, nay, the veritable Antichrist, and that it was only the break-up of that Parliament and the resort to the Protectorate that saved the land from lapsing into a howling wilderness of volunteer gospellers, without organization, and without Universities. For the Universities were distinctly involved, if not in the designs of the active Voluntaries in the Parliament, at least in the minds of some theorists for them outside. As the State ought not to endow Religion, it was maintained, neither ought it to endow Learning; and, as real Religion would fare better for the abolition of a State-Church, so real Learning would fare better for the abolition of the cob-webbed Universities. Pamphleteers conspicuous in this crusade against the Universities were the three Anabaptist preachers, William Dell, William Erbury, and John Webster; and Webster's book on the subject, called *Academiarum Examen*, and published Dec. 19, 1653, is one of decided ability, and worth reading yet.[1]

The statement that the Protectorate came into being in the interests of a Conservative policy generally, and especially for the preservation of an Established Church and the Universities, may seem a paradox to some now; but the fact, I repeat, was thoroughly understood at the time, and appears in all the contemporary representations of the collapse of the Barebones Parliament, and of the cause of that collapse. Thus, Clarendon, after saying, of the majority of that Parliament, that "their quarrel was against all who had called themselves ministers," and that "they resolved the function itself to be Antichristian," and were determined to abolish it altogether, and to root up the Universities just because they were the breeding places of a Clergy, hints that this "folly and sottishness" had probably been foreseen, and asserts at all events that it brought in the Protectorate. So Baillie, in writing from Scotland to his friend Spang abroad, tells him that the Barebones Parliament (which Baillie sarcastically calls the "Good Parliament," with reference to the special religiousness of those selected for it) were "no sooner set than they flew so high as to mind nothing but a Fifth Monarchy on Earth, to overthrow all magistracy and ministry as it stood, and put all in a new mule of their own," and adds that, when Cromwell "took on himself the new office of Protector, with a power to him and his Council supreme beyond, as it seemed to many, the regal line," the change was regarded as a relief "necessary for the time." Still more precise and emphatic is Baxter, in one long passage in which he mixes with the facts his own very peculiar hypothesis for explaining them. After giving a summary of the proceedings of the Barebones Parliament, he says, "The intelligent sort by this time did fully see that "Cromwell's design was, by causing and permitting destruc-"tion to hang over us, to necessitate the nation, whether they "would or not, to take him for their Governor, that he might "be their Protector. Being resolved that we should be "saved by him or perish, he made more use of the wild-"headed sectaries than barely to fight for him. They now "serve him as much by their heresies, their enmity to Learn-"ing and Ministry, their pernicious demands which tended to "confusion . . . For now he exclaimeth against the giddiness "of these unruly men, earnestly pleadeth for Order and "Government, and will needs become the patron of the "Ministry, yet so as to secure all others of their liberty. "Some that saw his design said, 'We will rather all perish, "and see both Tithes and Universities overthrown, than we "will any way submit to such deceitful usurpations.' Others

---

[1] The date of Webster's book is from Thomason's Catalogue. See a reference to the book, Vol. I. p. 232. It was replied to in *Vindiciæ Academiarum*, a joint production of Dr. John Wilkins and Dr. Seth Ward (both afterwards Bishops), and also incidentally by Owen in various Academic Speeches.

"said, 'It is the Providence of God, whoever be the instruments, which hath brought us into this necessity, which we "were unable to prevent; and, being in it, we are not bound "to choose our own destruction: therefore necessity requireth "us to accept of any one to rule us that is like to deliver us. "But the generality of the Ministers went the middle way." This middle way was Baxter's own. He relieved his conscience, he proceeds to say, by sufficient public protestation against Cromwell's "usurpation" and "perfidiousness"; but he did not think it his duty "to rave against him in the pulpit" or otherwise to "irritate him to mischief." And why? "The rather," says Baxter, "because, as he kept up "his approbation of a godly life in the general, and of all that "was good, except that which the interest of his sinful cause "engaged him to be against, so I perceived that it was his "design to do good in the main, and to promote the Gospel "and the interest of godliness more than any had done before "him, except in those particulars which his own interest was "against. And it was the principal means that henceforward "he trusted to for his own establishment, even by *doing good*, "that the people might love him, or at least be willing to "have his Government *for that good*."[1]

Cromwell, then, we may say, had entered on his Protectorate with two fixed ideas for his guidance in matters spiritual—(1) *An Established Non-Prelatic Church on a broad basis of Evangelical Comprehension*, to be liberally endowed and carefully looked after by the State; and (2) An ample or universal *Toleration of Dissent* round that Church. In the last he was but true to his life-long principle of Liberty of Conscience; how far the first had been the growth of deliberation since he had seen the supreme Magistracy coming into his own hands it might be difficult to say. At all events, the sustenance and regulation of an Established Church had become one of his main anxieties; and the two Ordinances the dates and titles of which have been given were the early utterances of his Protectorate on the subject. By the first a

---

[1] Clar. 795; Baillie, III. 289; Baxter's Life (1696) 70, 71.

Court of Thirty-eight Commissioners was set up, nine of them laymen and twenty-nine divines (increased to Forty-three, Sept. 2, 1654, by the addition of four more divines and one layman), who were to examine all future presentees to livings, and all who had been appointed to livings since the 1st of April, 1653, and to certify who were fit. At the head of this *Commission of Triers*, as they came to be called, was old Mr. Francis Rous, late Speaker of the Barebones Parliament; Major General Goffe and Alderman Tichbourne were two of his lay associates; and among the divines were John Owen, Thomas Goodwin, Thankful Owen, Caryl, Lockyer, Nye, Peter Sterry, Hugh Peters, and other Independents, with some Presbyterians of the Westminster Assembly, such as Arrowsmith, Tuckney, and Stephen Marshall, and one or two Baptists, such as John Tombes. For the rejection of any candidate at least *nine* of the Commissioners were to be present; and it was distinctly declared in the Ordinance that the approbation of candidates by the Commissioners was not to be construed as "any solemn or sacred setting apart" for the office of the ministry, but only as an expedient for putting candidates in a capacity to receive ministerial stipends and maintenance. Under the other Ordinance, which was for a *Commission of Ejectors*—i. e. a Commission for the ejection of scandalous and insufficient ministers and schoolmasters, at whatever date they had been appointed—the machinery was much more complex. There was to be a Committee of from fifteen to thirty gentlemen in every county, to act for the purpose in conjunction with eight or ten divines in each county, and to have powers to eject the unfit, allowing a small stipend to such as were married. The names of all the persons on these County Committees, to the number of some hundreds, with those of their clerical assessors in the several counties, are duly given in the Ordinance. On one or other of the County Committees were all the best known English gentry of the day, adherents to Cromwell or not; and Richard Baxter and others not at all friendly to Cromwell were among the clerical assessors.[1]

---

[1] See the two Ordinances at large: Scobell, Part II. 279—280 and 335—347.

Within six days after the passing of this last Ordinance the first Parliament of the Protectorate was to meet. That had been arranged by the Constituting Instrument of the Protectorate; the writs had been duly out in Cromwell's name since the 1st of June; and the elections had been going on all over England, Scotland, and Ireland. Yet, as if to show how much the Protector and his Council prized their temporary power of independent legislation, their last twelve Ordinances bear date the very day (Sept. 2, 1654) before the meeting of the Parliament.

Cromwell, indeed, was to meet that Parliament in the guise of a king, complete in all save the name. He had thought it right to clothe his Protectorship with all external state and ceremony. Whitehall was already called "His Highness's Court"; and his equipages in the streets, or between Whitehall and Hampton Court, where he often went on Saturdays, lacked nothing of the dignity of many-horsed coaches, liveries, guards, and outriders. Of his entertainments at Whitehall on great occasions that to the Dutch Ambassadors Nieuport, Beverning, and Jongestall, on April 27, 1654, the day of the Proclamation of Peace with the Dutch, may be a fit example. "Yesterday, at noon," writes Jongestall to the Count of Nassau, April 28, "we were in- "vited to dinner by His Highness the Lord Protector, where "we were nobly entertained. Mr. Strickland and the Master "of the Ceremonies came to fetch us, in two coaches of His "Highness, about half an hour past one, and brought us to "Whitehall, where twelve trumpeters were ready, sounding "against our coming. My Lady Nieuport and my wife were "brought to His Highness presently, the one by Mr. Strick- "land and the other by the Master of the Ceremonies; who "[i. e. His Highness] received us with great demonstration "of amity. After we staid a little, we were conducted into "another room, where we found a table ready covered. His "Highness sat on one side of it alone; my Lord Beverning, "Nieuport, and myself, at the upper end; and my Lord "President Lawrence and others next to us. There was in "the same room another table covered, for other Lords of "the Council and others. At the table of my Lady Pro-"tectrice dined my Lady Nieuport, my wife, my Lady "Lambert, my Lord Protector's daughter, and mine. The "music played all the while we were at dinner. The Lord "Protector [after dinner] had us into another room, where "the Lady Protectrice and others came to us; where we had "also music, and voices, and a psalm sung, which [i. e. the "music-sheet containing the Psalm] His Highness gave us "[the Ambassadors], and told us it was yet the best paper "that had been exchanged between us; and from thence we "were had into a gallery, next the river, where we walked "with His Highness about half an hour, and then took our "leaves, and were conducted back again to our houses, after "the same manner as we were brought."[1] The title of "my Lord," here applied by Jongestall to the members of the Council, had become not uncommon, and Mr. Secretary Thurloe had begun to be called "The Right Honourable." Cromwell had also conferred knighthoods, though yet rather sparingly. The first had been on the 8th of Feb. 1653–4, when Thomas Vyner, Lord Mayor of the City of London, entertained His Highness at a great city-banquet in Grocers' Hall, and was made Sir Thomas before His Highness went away.[2] It was more to the point that His Highness, in the very beginning of his Protectorate, had thought it right to renew the patents of all the English Judges, save one, so that they should hold office under his Chief Magistracy. He had at the same time reassigned their functions and circuits, and had added, as we have seen, Matthew Hale to their number.

---

[1] Thurloe, II. 257.

[2] Whitlocke, under date.

CHAPTER IV.

MILTON'S LIFE AND SECRETARYSHIP THROUGH THE FIRST NINE MONTHS OF OLIVER'S FIRST PROTECTORATE: DEC. 1653—SEPT. 1654.

REVISION OF THE COUNCIL ESTABLISHMENT UNDER THURLOE: MILTON'S SERVICES RETAINED.—A LULL OF SIX MONTHS IN HIS SECRETARYSHIP: PUBLICATION OF HIS *DEFENSIO SECUNDA*, MAY 1654: ACCOUNT OF THE BOOK: ITS EXPOSURE OF MORUS AND HIS ANTECEDENTS, AND ATTACKS ON ULAC AND ON THE MEMORY OF SALMASIUS: HISTORICAL AND AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL PASSAGES: THE PANEGYRIC ON QUEEN CHRISTINA OF SWEDEN: THE PANEGYRICS ON BRADSHAW, FAIRFAX, FLEETWOOD, LAMBERT, OVERTON, AND OTHERS: THE GRAND PANEGYRIC ON CROMWELL: EXAMINATION OF MILTON'S RELATIONS TO THE PROTECTOR AND HIS GOVERNMENT: MILTON AN ARDENT OLIVERIAN, BUT WITH RESERVES: NATURE OF THE RESERVES: SIGNIFICANCE OF HIS PRAISES OF BRADSHAW AND OVERTON: HIS NOTIONS OF POLITICAL LIBERTY: HIS CAUTIONS TO CROMWELL AGAINST ARBITRARINESS, OVER-LEGISLATION, AND A POLICY OF REPRESSION: HIS DISLIKE OF CROMWELL'S ESTABLISHED CHURCH.—PRESENTATION COPIES OF THE *DEFENSIO SECUNDA*: ANDREW MARVELL AGAIN: HIS TUTORSHIP, BY CROMWELL'S APPOINTMENT, TO YOUNG MR. DUTTON, AND RESIDENCE WITH HIS PUPIL IN THE FAMILY OF THE OXENBRIDGES AT ETON: HIS LETTER THENCE TO MILTON ABOUT THE *DEFENSIO SECUNDA*, AND THE DELIVERY OF ONE OF THE PRESENTATION COPIES IN PARTICULAR: MARVELL'S LATIN VERSES ON CROMWELL'S

PORTRAIT : CYRIACK SKINNER NOW MUCH WITH MILTON : HENRY OLDENBURG : MILTON'S LETTER TO HIM : DOUBTS AT LAST AS TO MORUS'S AUTHORSHIP OF THE *REGII SANGUINIS CLAMOR*: HISTORY OF MORUS SINCE THE APPEARANCE OF THAT BOOK : HIS ALARM ON HEARING OF THE *DEFENSIO SECUNDA* AS FORTHCOMING, AND HIS EFFORTS THROUGH THE DUTCH AMBASSADOR TO STOP THE PUBLICATION : HIS HORROR WHEN COPIES REACHED HOLLAND : RECEPTION OF THE BOOK THERE : ULAC'S PROJECT OF A FOREIGN EDITION OF IT, TO BE BOUND UP WITH A REPLY FROM MORUS : COMPLIMENTARY MENTION OF THE GREEK PHILARAS IN THE *DEFENSIO SECUNDA*: DIFFICULTIES OF PHILARAS IN PARIS : HIS VISIT TO LONDON AND CALL ON MILTON : LETTER OF MILTON TO PHILARAS ON THE SUBJECT OF HIS BLINDNESS.

The first mention of Milton in the Order Books of the Council of the Protectorate is on Friday, Feb. 3, 1653-4. The Protectorate was then six weeks old, and the Council had been fully constituted, with Lawrence for its President, Thurloe for its chief Secretary, and Mr. Henry Scobell and Mr. William Jessop as the Secretaries-Assistant. The rest of the staff were, doubtless, hanging on with the understanding that they were retained; but not till the afternoon meeting of the day above named was the Council at leisure to pass a formal resolution on the subject. Then, Lawrence being in the Chair, and the other members present being Sir Anthony Ashley Cooper, Colonel Sydenham, Major-General Lambert, Colonel Montague, Viscount Lisle, Sir Charles Wolseley, Mr. Strickland, and Sir Gilbert Pickering, it was minuted as follows :—

"According to an order of Wednesday last, Mr. Secretary Thurloe did this day present to the Council an establishment of under clerks and officers for attending and despatching of the affairs of the Council, viz. :—

Mr. Philip Meadows, Latin Secretary, at *per annum*	£200	0	0
The Serjeant at Arms, at 20*s*. *per diem* . . .	365	0	0
Mr. Gualter Frost, Treasurer for the Council's Contingencies, at *per annum*	—	—	—

MR. MILTON, at *per annum*	–	–	–
Seven Under Clerks,—viz. Joseph Frost, John Frost, Matthew Lea, Thomas Lea, Isaac Ewers, William Symon, Matthew Fairbank,—at 6*s.* 8*d.* *per diem* each	851	13	4”

[There follow the names of *ten* messengers, at 5*s.* *per diem* each, with 6*d.* the mile for riding expenses, making a total of £1003 15*s.* *per annum;* also those of *nine* serjeant-deputies, at 3*s.* 4*d.* *per diem* each, and 6*d.* a mile for riding expenses, making a total of £486 13*s.* 4*d.* *per annum;* and the two closing items are £36 *per annum* for “a man to light fires,” &c. (at 2*s.* *per diem*), and £292 per annum for other sundry expenses.]

The Council then and there approved of “the said Establishment presented by Mr. Secretary Thurloe,” only directing that Mr. Gualter Frost’s salary should be £400 *per annum.* The Protector’s assent having been duly signified, the whole order took effect.

On comparing the new Establishment with the Establishment under the last Council of the Barebones Parliament, one sees that there was now, by Thurloe’s advice, a recast of the former arrangements in some points. Thurloe’s two assistant Secretaries were then Mr. Gualter Frost and Mr. William Jessop, at salaries of £365 a year each; and Mr. Philip Meadows, who had been brought in to assist Milton at a salary of £100 a year, had just had his duties extended, and his salary raised to £200 a year, but had not received any official designation interfering with Milton’s full right still to the title of Secretary for the Foreign Tongues. Now, however, there are two or three modifications. Mr. Henry Scobell having been brought in as Jessop’s colleague in the Assistant Secretaryship under Thurloe, a new post is found for Frost. He was to be Treasurer for the Council’s Contingencies, i. e. their Cashier. As the post was a new one, Thurloe, while naming Frost for it, left the amount of salary for the consideration of the Council. As they made it £400 a year, Frost was bettered by the change to the extent of £35 a year. No increase of salary was proposed for Meadows; but it is noteworthy that Thurloe in his draft, while re-proposing £200 a year as the fit salary for Meadows, styles him distinctly

"Latin Secretary," at the same time naming Milton as a person to be continued in the service of the Council, but with what title and at what salary he does not venture to suggest. One infers that Thurloe, the very model of a General Secretary, had become doubtful how far it might be right for the Lord Protector and the Council to retain Milton in his old capacity and with his old title, now that he was disabled for so much of the actual work by his blindness, but that he knew they would like to retain him in some capacity, and with some salary, and left the matter to their own decision. The Council did not decide it at their present meeting; but we know otherwise that Milton, notwithstanding the increase of nominal dignity for Meadows, did continue in his old post and with his old title as Latin Secretary or Secretary for the Foreign Tongues, and that his salary of about £288 *per annum* remained for the present undisturbed. In short, the title of *Latin Secretary Extraordinary*, already suggested as describing the nature and extent of Milton's official occupations since his blindness had disqualified him for the entire work of his department, continues to describe, as accurately as possible, his position through the whole of the Protectorate.

Another document, of the same date as the foregoing, may be quoted for its details. It is from *The Money Warrant Books* of the Council, and is, in fact, the first warrant which Mr. Gualter Frost received in his new capacity of Treasurer for the Council's contingencies. It is the Protector's own warrant for the immediate discharge of all arrears of salary and wages due to any persons on the establishment *before* the Protectorate:—

"OLIVER P.

"These are to will and require you, out of such moneys as are or shall come to your hands for the use of the Council, to pay to the several persons on the other side endorsed the several sums to their names mentioned, making in all the sum of £1078 12*s.* 1*d.*; being so much due unto them on the first of January last included for their several salaries: of which you are not to fail, and for which this shall be your warrant. Given at Whitehall this 3rd of Febr. 1653 [1653-4.]

"To Mr. Gualter Frost."

[Particulars endorsed.]

Mr. Secretary Thurloe, for one quarter from the 2nd Oct. to the 1st of Jan. last included . .	£200	0	0
Mr. Jessop, 17th Oct. to the 1st of Jan. included: 77 days	77	0	0
Mr. Gualter Frost, as Secretary Assistant to the late Council of State for the same time to the 12th of Dec.: 71 days	71	0	0
Mr. John Milton, for half a year from the 4th of July to the 1st of Jan. last included: at 15*s.* 10½*d.* *per diem*	144	9	3
Mr. Philip Meadows, for one quarter from the 2nd of Oct. to the 1st of Jan.	50	0	0
Joseph Frost, John Frost, Matthew Lea, Thomas Lea, Isaac Ewers, John Lennard, John Babington, John Raymond: Clerks for dispatch of the Council's business, at 6*s.* 8*d.* *per diem*, for one quarter ending 1st of Jan.	242	13	4
Joseph Butler, Thomas Pidcock, John Priestley, Richard Freeman, Henry Symball, Daniel Potter, Geo. Hussey, Rowland Fawkard, Roger Reed, Thomas Bulmer, Edward Osbaldston, Edward Fleetwood: messengers to the late Council, at 5*s.* *per diem*, for one quarter ending 1st Jan. inst. .	273	0	0
Henry Giffard, for keeping the Treasury Room to the Council, at 2*s.* 6*d.* *per diem*, for the time above-said	11	7	6
Robert Stebbin, for making fires and keeping the door leading to the Secretary's Office, at 2*s.* *per diem*, for the time above-said	9	2	0
	£1078	12	1

Putting all our information together, we thus learn that, after Thurloe and the Council had recast the former Establishment (making some considerable changes among the underlings as well as among the superiors), the Protectorate started with an official staff the heads of which, in the order of their salaries, were Thurloe at £800 a year, Gualter Frost at £400 a year, the Serjeant at Arms at £365 a year, Jessop and Scobell also at £365 a year each, Milton at about £288 a year, and Meadows at £200 a year, while underneath these there were seven Clerks at 6*s.* 8*d.* a day each, ten messengers at 5*s.* a day each, nine deputy-serjeants or tipstaves at 3*s.* 4*d.* a day each, and two or three door-keepers. The total cost of the Council Establishment, as I calculate, was about £5454 *per annum.* By our rule of multiplying by 3½ for the difference of money-value, this would rate at about £19,000 a year now. By the same rule the present equivalents of the salaries may be ascertained.

While the Council Order Books distinctly prove that Milton was retained in the service of Oliver's Protectorate in a capacity which may be called *The Latin Secretaryship Extraordinary*, it is not to these Books that we can henceforth trust, to any great extent, for the record of Milton's official performances. This is owing to Thurloe's method of keeping the Council Minutes through the Protectorate, or the method adopted by Jessop and Scobell for him. In the by-gone days, when the elder Frost had been General Secretary and the younger Frost his assistant, Milton's individuality in the foreign department had been scrupulously respected by the mention of his name in the Order Books in connexion with every piece of business referred to him specially. Now it is different. Thurloe keeps all the strings in his own hands; and, while it is minuted that such or such a document or translation is ordered, it is rarely that the person is named to whom the duty is referred. We see that Thurloe himself worked prodigiously; and we know that he had Scobell, Jessop, and Meadows, about him for subordinate penmen, and that Milton was not half a mile off, and could appear when wanted; but we are left to imagine that the distribution of work among the five was a matter of Thurloe's pleasure or of his understanding with the Council, not needing formal record. It does so happen, however, that Milton's name disappears henceforth from the Council Order Books more completely than might have been expected, in his case, even under such an arrangement. While mentions of Jessop, Scobell, and Meadows, not to speak of "Mr. Secretary Thurloe" himself, are pretty frequent in the Order Books of Oliver's Protectorate in one connexion or another, there is, so far as I have observed, but one mention more of Milton by name in the whole four years and a half of them. It will be quoted in due time. Meanwhile, let the reader, if he should miss henceforth clusters of continued excerpt from the Council Order Books in exhibition of Milton's official industry, guard against supposing on that account that Milton was doing nothing and was merely a blind supernumerary. Fortunately we have other, and most authentic, means of knowing the nature and extent of his official industry under the Protectorate; and, when we present the information in detail, it will be seen that, though Thurloe was Cromwell's right-hand man, Milton was very far indeed from being a cipher. The truth is that Cromwell was to get much more work, of certain kinds, out of Milton in his blindness than had been demanded from him through all his preceding years of Secretaryship, while he had his eyesight.

Not a scrap of Milton's Secretarial work, however, in the form of correspondence or state-papers, belongs to the first six months of the Protectorate. Through those months (Dec. 1653—June 1654), though the Protector's great Treaty of Peace with the Dutch was then successfully brought to an issue, though a Treaty with Sweden was also concluded, though Treaties with Portugal and Denmark were in progress, and though there was incessant negotiation also with France and Spain, not to speak of minor States, Thurloe and Meadows must have managed all the necessary translations and draftings of documents between them, without troubling Mr. Milton. The reason, I believe, is that Mr. Milton was then known to have a piece of work in hand in his house in Petty France in the interest of which the Protector and the Council might well dispense with his services in the routine business at Whitehall. Thurloe and Meadows could write letters and draft diplomatic documents; but who could compete with Mr. Milton in writing a book?

"*Joannis Miltoni Angli pro Populo Anglicano Defensio Secunda: Contra Infamem Libellum Anonymum cui titulus 'Regii Sanguinis Clamor ad Cœlum adversus Parricidas Anglicanos.' Londini, Typis Newcomianis*, 1654" ("Second Defence for the English People by John Milton, Englishman, in reply to an Infamous Book entitled 'Cry of the King's Blood to

Heaven against the English Parricides.' London, from Newcome's Press, 1654"): such was the title of a small octavo volume, of 173 pages, which was out in London on the 30th of May, 1654.[1] It was the fulfilment at last of that new task of literary championship for the Commonwealth which had been assigned to Milton nearly two years before by the Council of State of the Rump Parliament. It was, at the same time, Milton's defence against the most libellous, and in some literary respects the ablest, attack that had yet been made upon himself. The wonder is that it had been delayed so long. The delay has been already explained as occasioned partly by the fact that the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor* had come upon Milton when he was struggling with the first difficulties of his blindness, partly by his subsequent expectation of being able to deal at the same time with the long-promised book of Salmasius in answer to the *Defensio Prima.* The death of Salmasius in September 1653, with his book unpublished and even its existence left problematical, had at length determined Milton to fall on the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor* by itself. He had probably begun the work not long before the institution of the Protectorate, and his perseverance in it during the four months which followed his renomination to office in the Protector's service may well have been accepted instead of all the more ordinary sorts of official duty during that period. Indeed there must have been something like a formal understanding on the subject with Cromwell and the Council, releasing Milton for the time from ordinary duty, and empowering him to proceed in the literary task originally assigned him under the Rump Government. The difference would be that, whereas his Reply to the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor,* had it come forth at the time when it was originally commissioned, would have been another defence of the Commonwealth of the Rump, it had now necessarily to be adapted to the conditions of the Protectorate. That was not unimportant. The book may have been hailed by many as Milton's first complete return to Literature after his blindness, and the first complete proof that he had conquered that calamity; but it may have been hailed also, with some interest, as the expression of the views of so eminent a Republican respecting the changed system of the Commonwealth.

---

[1] Date is from the Thomason copy in the British Museum.

The opening is in the high and stately strain of self-esteem so common with Milton, and may be given thus in translation :—

That which in every human life and in every sort of business is the first of duties, namely, that we should be always grateful to God and mindful of His benefits, and especially, if in anything there has been success beyond hope and design, that we should as soon as possible return express and solemn thanks for the same, this I see to be now incumbent upon me in the very beginning of my discourse, mainly for three reasons :—First, because I have been born in those times of my country in which the eminent valour of the citizens, with a grandeur and constancy of mind in them surpassing all that can be praised in their forefathers, has been able, after due invocation of God, and all the while following His most manifest guidance, to achieve, by a series of acts and examples the bravest since the world was made, the deliverance of the State from a heavy thraldom, and of Religion from a most unworthy servitude. Next, because, when many had suddenly started up who, as is generally the way of the vulgar, were vilifying odiously those illustrious deeds, and one above the rest, puffed up and heady with literary pride and the opinion conceived of him by his flock of admirers, had wickedly undertaken, in a very scandalous book written against us, the defence of despotism universally, then it was I, rather than any one else,—from some impression that I was not unfit either to meet an adversary of so great name or to speak of so great affairs,—that received from the liberators of my country themselves, with the common consent of all besides, the commission publicly to defend, whoever else might come after me, the cause both of the English people and of Liberty as involved therein. Finally, because, in a matter so arduous and full of expectation, I neither disappointed the hope my countrymen had of me and their aforesaid resolution, nor failed to give satisfaction to a vast number of foreigners, both of the learned class and of those skilled in affairs, but so routed my opponent, with all his huge assurance, that he yielded at once, broken alike in spirit and in reputation, and in the whole three years of his subsequent life, though threatening and fuming much, gave us no farther trouble, save that he called to his aid the obscure labour of some utterly despicable persons, and suborned I know not what silly and extravagant adulators to repatch by their eulogies, as far as might be, the unexpected and recent ruin of his character. Of which more presently.

Proceeding in the same strain, Milton takes occasion again to propound his favourite idea that in every age of great national action it is highly important that there should be some who, though not partaking directly in such action, should look on and worthily appreciate, lending their powers for the description and celebration of what has been done, and for the defence and exposition of what the men of action may still intend. It had been his own lot, he says, partly from his studious habits from youth upwards, partly from the uncertainty of his health, to be rather a spectator of the great recent Revolution in the British Islands than one of its armed soldiers or Parliamentary leaders. But from the first he had contributed to the cause zealously and steadily after his own fashion; nor had he ever avoided his share of the dangers and risks. And now, whether he considers what is past, or realizes to himself the magnitude of the task on which he is entering in this his Second Defence of the English People, may he not be content with the part assigned him?

MAGNITUDE AND CELEBRITY OF HIS TASK.

I would make no comparison of myself with anyone, even the lowest in station; nor would I speak a word too arrogantly: but, as often as I bethink myself of this noble and renowned cause, and this most honourable office too of defending our defenders themselves, assigned me by their own votes and judgments, I confess I can hardly refrain from rising to a loftier and more daring strain than befits an exordium, and seeking something grander still to say: seeing that in whatever degree I am indubitably beaten by the famous orators of antiquity, not only in the power of pleading, but even in style (especially in the foreign tongue which I necessarily use, and in which very often I give myself no kind of satisfaction), in the same degree I beat them all of every age by the nobility and consequence of my subject. Whence there has arisen such an amount of expectation and widely diffused interest about the affair that already I feel myself not as if in a forum or law-court, surrounded only by one people, whether Roman or Athenian, but as if, with nearly all Europe listening, and as it were seated together before me and criticising, I had somehow addressed my former Defence, and were now again about to address this one, to an aggregate of all the meetings and conventions of the gravest men, cities, and nations, wheresoever I seem to myself, now that I have begun my journey, to be surveying from high in the air the tracts of land across the sea and the wide-stretched regions, crowded countenances innumerable, all equally unknown, but betraying their close conjunction with me by the signs of their sympathy. Here I have before my eyes the manly strength of the Germans, stiff against slavery; there the lively, and rightly called liberal, impetuosity of the French; here the deliberate valour of the Spaniard; there the settled and self-possessed magnanimity of the Italian. Whatever anywhere of free aspiration, whatever of ingenuous or magnanimous promise, either lies prudently quiet or publicly professes itself, all seem within my vision, some tacitly favouring, some openly approving, some running forth and greeting with applause, some yielding at last to conviction and surrendering themselves captive. I seem to myself, with such multitudes about me, even from the Pillars of Hercules to the extreme limits of the Indian Bacchus, to be bringing expelled and exiled Liberty home again everywhere after a long lapse of time, or, as is told of Triptolemus of old, to be importing among the nations the produce of my own land, only a produce far nobler than any gift of cereals,—disseminating, to wit, through cities, kingdoms, and peoples, the restored enjoyment of free civil life.

Through more of the like Milton at last pounces on his precise subject, the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor*, and the rest of his Introduction consists of a compound invective against the three persons whom he identifies with that book in one capacity or another. Salmasius is referred to as its original begetter; there is an exposure of Morus as its reputed author; and Ulac, the publisher, does not escape. The following extracts convey the substance:—

REASON OF THE DELAY OF THIS SECOND DEFENCE:—"To the author of the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor* I should have prepared a speedier answer, according to his deserts, had he not hitherto protected himself by false rumours—announcing over and over that Salmasius himself was sweating at the anvil, fabricating new volumes against us, which were just to be out: by which he gained only this much, that the punishment of his slandering was somewhat delayed; for I thought it better to wait and keep myself whole for the more powerful adversary. But I take my warfare with Salmasius to be now over, he being dead; in what manner dead I will not say, for I will not make his death his fault, as he made my blindness mine. Yet there are who attribute the guilt of that murder also to *us*—to those too sharp strictures of ours, to wit. They say that, always fixing those hooks deeper in himself by resisting, and seeing the work he had on hand advancing more and more slowly, and the time of reply past, and interest in his work gone, and recollecting also the loss of his fame and reputation, and the diminution of his favour with princes on account of his bad defence of the cause of Sovereignty, he died at last rather of a three years' grief and depression of spirit than of any actual malady. Be this as it may, if I have again to encounter an enemy so well known to me, if there must be even a posthumous war with him, there is no reason why I should fear the languid and dying efforts of one whose ferocious attacks at their best I bore easily enough."

Anonymity of the Book:—"Hoy! who are you? A man or a nobody? Not the lowest of men, not slaves even, are without a name. Shall I always then have to deal with anonymous persons? For my part, ὦ ἄνδρες ἀνώνυμοι (for it may be lawful to give a Greek name to those for whom I cannot find a Latin one), I declare that, though your Claudius rose up without a name to write on Kingly Power, certainly a very congenial subject, and I might use his example, I am so far from being ashamed either of myself or of my cause that I should consider it base to approach such a task unless with my name openly avowed. . . . Why our author should be anonymous will soon appear. Whether, basely hired, he has, in imitation of Salmasius, sold this *Cry* of his to the *Blood Royal*, or whether he is pale with the consciousness of infamous teaching, or whether he is of flagitious and disgraceful life, no wonder he should seek to hide himself: or perhaps he is making his arrangements so that, whenever he scents a richer chance of emolument, it may be safe for him to desert the cause of Kings and transfer himself to some future Republic—nor this either without the example of his great Salmasius, who, in his old age, taken with the glitter of lucre, ratted from the Orthodox to Bishops, from the Liberals to the Royalists. You caller from the coal-hole, you do not after all cheat us as to who you are; in vain have you sought that concealment; believe me, you are dragged to light; you will swear downright, as long as you live, either that I am not blind, or that you at least have not escaped my blinkings. Who then he is, what sort of fellow, and by what hope, what enticements, what allurements, he was brought into the service of the Royal Cause (the story is almost Milesian or Baian) hear now if you have leisure!

HOW THE BOOK WAS WRITTEN: ALEXANDER MORUS AND HIS ANTECEDENTS:—"He is a certain MORUS, part Scotch, part French (lest one nation, one country, should have the too great burden of the entire disgrace of him): an unprincipled fellow, and,—by abundant and various testimonies, among which are to be included, what is worst, those of former friends whom he has changed from intimates into utter enemies,—treacherous, lying, ungrateful, malevolent, and a perpetual slanderer not only of men, but of women also, whose chastity he is accustomed to spare no more than their reputation. To pass over the obscurities of his early years, he first taught Greek at Geneva; but, though often interpreting his own name *Morus* in Greek to his pupils [the word means 'Fool' in Greek], he could not unlearn being a fool and rascal himself. On the contrary, he was the rather driven on by such a madness, conscious as he was of so many profligacies, though perhaps not yet found out, that he did not shrink from seeking the office of Pastor in the Church, and staining it with those *morals* of his. But he could not long escape the censure of his Presbyters, womanish and vain as he was, noted also for many other crimes, and found guilty of many errors from orthodoxy, which he both basely abjured and impiously retained after he had abjured them,— at last, too, clearly convicted of adultery. He had conceived a violent passion for his landlord's maidservant; and, though she was married shortly afterwards to another, he did not cease to pursue her . . . His explanations of the affair gave no satisfaction to the Presbyters; they had no option but to think of censuring him as an adulterer and adjudging him wholly unworthy of the pastoral office. The heads of this and the like accusations are to this day preserved in the Public Library of that city. Meantime, while all was yet undivulged, having received a call into Holland, by the procuration of

Salmasius, from the French Church in Middleburg,—greatly to the disgust of Spanheim, a truly learned man and most excellent pastor, who had formerly known him well in Geneva,—he at length obtained from the Genevans what they called 'testimonial letters,' though not without difficulty, and on the strict condition of his leaving the place, and the letters themselves cool enough: some indeed thinking it was unendurable that a fellow of that sort should be decorated with any Church attestation whatsoever, but others arguing that anything was more endurable than the fellow himself. As soon as he came into Holland, having gone to pay his respects to Salmasius, he cast his wicked eyes, in Salmasius's house, on a maidservant of Madame Salmasius, called Bontia,— for the fellow's taste is always for maidservants: hence he began to cultivate the society of Salmasius with the utmost assiduity, and Bontia's as often as he could. I know not whether it was Salmasius, taken with the attentions and flattery of the man, or Morus, thinking he had found out a fine opportunity for more frequently meeting Bontia there, that first turned the conversation on Milton's Answer to Salmasius. However it was, Morus undertakes the defence of Salmasius; and Salmasius promises to Morus, by his influence, the Theological Chair in that city . . . On pretext of consulting Salmasius about the work, Morus frequented the house day and night . . . He promises marriage to Bontia, and so seduces her . . . Meanwhile the *Clamor Regii Sanguinis* broke forth. Then Morus, not a little inflated by this production of his, and feeling that he had obliged the whole Orange faction, had already devoured no end of Professorial Chairs in his greedy fancy, and had accordingly deserted his Bontia, now with child, as but a poor little maidservant. She, complaining of the slight and the deceit, appealed both to the Synod and to the Magistrates. The affair was thus divulged at last, and was long a subject of laughter and jokes in private parties and assemblies. Whence some one (and surely of a sprightly wit, whoever he was) made this distich :—

Galli ex concubitu gravidam te, Bontia, Mori
Quis bene moratam morigeramque neget?[1]

---

[1] This Epigram first appeared in the London *Mercurius Politicus* of Sept. 30, 1652, as from a Dutch correspondent (ante p. 462). It is always now printed as Milton's own among his Latin verses; but his mode of mentioning it here seems to tell against that idea, as indeed does the mode of its occurrence originally in *Merc. Pol.*

Bontia alone did not laugh; but neither did she make anything by her complaints. For the *Cry of the King's Blood* had easily overborne the cry of the seduction and the wailing of the seduced little woman. Salmasius also, taking to heart the injury and slur upon himself and his whole family, and vexed at being so made a laughing-stock by his friend and eulogist, and a butt for the enemy, not very long after breathed his last, this added misfortune perhaps having come as an aggravation of all his former mischances in the King's cause."

ULAC THE PUBLISHER:—"For the business of publishing the Book one Ulac seemed far the fittest person. Salmasius easily persuaded *him* not only to undertake the printing, for which nobody would have blamed him, but also to profess himself the author of a certain Epistle to Charles, stuffed with scurrilities and foul words against me, who had never known the man, and to put his signature to the same. Lest any one should be surprised that he let himself be induced so easily to attack me in that impudent manner without cause, and made nothing even of transferring to himself and fathering other people's intemperance, I will tell what I have ascertained of his conduct generally. Ulac, where born, I know not, is a wandering book-dealer in a small way, a notorious cheat and bankrupt. He was for some time a clandestine bookseller in London, but fled from that city, after numberless frauds, deep in debt. He was known afterwards in Paris to the whole quarter of St. Jacques as a person of broken credit and marked for his malpractices; but he disappeared thence too a good while ago, and cannot show his face in that neighbourhood again; and now, if any one wants a consummate rascal for some shabby work, there he is at the Hague, a regenerated Printer. [Milton here adds the story of Ulac's applications to himself, through Hartlib, for some book to print: see ante pp. 466, 467.]"

The invective against Morus, Salmasius, and Ulac, thus begun in the Introduction, recurs sporadically through the rest of the Book. Of the misdeeds of Morus, and especially of his amour with Bontia, we are reminded over and over again, with the most savage ingenuity of repetition, and a license of vituperation that becomes perfectly painful. Once, for example, after exulting in the idea that Morus had been turned adrift by the Church at Middleburrg, and in the news that the magistrates of Amsterdam had recently forbidden his farther appearance in the pulpit in that city, and had left him only his Greek Professorship [an error: the Amsterdam Professorship of Morus was that of Sacred History], Milton goes on to inform him that even of that Professorship he will retain only a single letter in the end—to wit, the Greek capital Π, shaped admirably for his gibbet. Ever and anon, too, Morus or Ulac leads back to Salmasius, and the poor man is torn from his grave for grotesque re-exhibition. The excuse is partly that Salmasius had put the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor* to press, had contributed to it, and was still speaking through it; but farther excuse is to be found in the provoking persistence of the book in that old vein of ecstasy about "the great Salmasius" which so disgusted Milton, and also in the dark hints thrown out that papers of Salmasius, hitherto kept back, might yet appear for Milton's crushing annihilation. One passage may be quoted, in which Milton notices this threat of a posthumous onslaught on him by Salmasius. It is part of the comment upon Ulac's dedicatory Epistle of the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor*, addressed to Charles II (ante pp. 453, 454). The phrases there in eulogy of Salmasius—"the wonderful Salmasius," "his stupendous and infinite erudition," "his heavenly genius," &c.—have already been duly ridiculed, with the pertinent additional remark that, even had the phrases been true, it was an outrage on all good taste that Salmasius should have negotiated the publication of such phrases himself, by actually procuring the MS. (if he did not write it, suggests Milton,) and taking it to the printer. Then the farther sentence in the Dedicatory Epistle is quoted where mention is made of that "new impression against the Rebels," or "castigation of Milton," on which Salmasius was labouring before his death:—

> "You therefore [Ulac or Morus] are like the little client-fish in advance of whale Salmasius, who is threatening 'impressions' on these shores: we are sharpening our irons so as to be ready to squeeze out whatever may be in the 'impressions' and 'castigations,' whether of oil or pickle. Meanwhile we shall admire the more than Pythagorean goodness of your great man, who, in his

pity for the animals, and especially for the fishes, which are not spared even in Lent, poor things, has provided so many volumes for decently wrapping them up in, and has bequeathed by will, I may say, to so many thousands of poor sprats and pilchards paper coats individually.

Herrings, rejoice, and all ye scaly millions
That live in brine and shiver through the winter!
The Knight, Salmasius, pitying your case,
Kindly intends you all a suit of clothes.
Whole reams before him, he is getting ready
Fine paper-jackets for you, each one blazoned
With his own coat of arms and decorations,
That you may figure, when you come to market,
In full Knight's livery, packed in jars and barrels,
A pleasant sight to the fish-handling folk,
The folk that wipe their noses with their elbows.

I had this ready for the long expected edition of the noble book over the 'impression' of which, as you say, Salmasius was labouring, while you, Morus, were disgracing his house with that Bontia affair. And truly Salmasius seems to have been preciously hard and long at work to get it through; for, a few days before his death, when a certain learned man, from whom I have the fact, sent to enquire when he was to bring out the second part of his *Treatise on the Pope's Primacy,* he answered that he was not to return to that labour till he had finished what he had already by him of his Reply to Milton. So, it seems, I was preferred to the Pope as an object of refutation."

Though the nature of the book to which Milton's *Defensio Secunda* was a reply did not bind him to any particular arrangement of his topics, or permit any systematic division into chapters, he is able, in commenting on this or that stray remark in the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor,* to go over a good deal of the old ground of the controversy, and to furnish new anecdotes and illustrations of some historical value. The following is an instance:—

OLD CHARGES AGAINST CROMWELL.

"I return now to what I promised above, and will produce here the chief charges against Cromwell, that it may be understood from their utter want of weight in the mass how frivolous they are in detail. '*He declared in the presence of many witnesses*,' you say, '*that it was his intention to overturn all monarchies and destroy all Kings*.' What credit is due to your statements of fact we have already often enough seen; perhaps some one of the refugees has told you that Cromwell said this; of your many alleged witnesses you do not name one: your unauthorized calumny, therefore, falls to the ground. Cromwell is not a man that any one ever heard boastful of his past actions; as little is it his habit to promise or threaten anything in an arrogant style concerning what remains unachieved and may be so difficult; those who gave you that information, therefore, must have been liars rather by natural disposition than by design, when they attributed a saying to him so completely out of accord with his character. . . . Another charge is that it was Cromwell that '*persuaded the King to withdraw secretly to the Isle of Wight*.' . . . Very well; but then, on that supposition, I do wonder at those Royalists who are so constantly assuring us of the extreme prudence of Charles. . . . Charles is persuaded, Charles is imposed upon, Charles is deluded; now he is struck with some alarm, and again he is dazzled by some vain hope; Charles is driven or carried hither and thither, a mere piece of luggage in the hands of all alike, friends or foes! Let the Royalists either remove all this from their writings, or let them cease to speak of the sagacity of Charles. I confess indeed that, though it is a fine thing to excel in prudence and penetration, yet such a distinction is not without its inconveniences at a time when a State is troubled with factions, inasmuch as the man of deepest insight is then on that very account the most liable to the calumnies of all parties. This has often been Cromwell's obstacle. The Presbyterians on the one side, the Royalists on the other, when they thought themselves harshly treated in any matter, imputed it not to the common purpose of the Parliament, but always to Cromwell alone; nay, if they miscarried in anything by their own imprudence, they were not ashamed to attribute the miscarriage to the wiles and craft of Cromwell; *he* was made responsible for all; it was always Cromwell that was to blame. Yet it is most certain that the flight of Charles to the Isle of Wight came upon Cromwell, who was then some miles off, as unexpectedly as a piece of news as upon any one of the members of the Parliament who were then in town, and whom he informed of the fact by letter, treating it distinctly as a most unexpected occurrence of which he had himself just heard. The real fact was that the King, terrified by the outcries of the whole Army, who had found no improvement in him by all they had done for him or promised, and had therefore begun to demand his punishment, resolved to seek safety by a nocturnal flight, with only two persons in his confidence, but that, having his mind better made up to the single fact of flight than on the question whither he was to flee, he was obliged, by the inexperience or timidity of his companions, in his destitution of farther advice for his direction, to surrender himself of his own accord to Hammond, Governor of the Isle of Wight, in the hope that he might easily escape thence to France or Holland by a vessel quietly provided for the purpose. This is what I have learnt of the King's flight to the Isle of Wight from those who had the closest means of thorough information about the whole affair. . . . But let us look farther at Cromwell's great crime in having beaten, in a battle nobler than any on recent record, the invading Scots who were already promising themselves the subjugation of England. '*Amid these confusions*,' you say, '*when Cromwell was away with his Army*—yes! when Cromwell, fatigued with the reduction of the also revolted Welsh, and with a long siege undertaken in the course of that duty, bravely threw himself in the way of the Scots, who had already advanced into the bowels of England, and were threatening the existence of the Parliament, and beat those Scots, and most gloriously put them to rout—*the Presbyterians had taken a disgust to Cromwell*.' There you speak the truth. Yes! while *he* was beating the common enemy at the hazard of his life, *they* were accusing in trumped-up charges the very man who was thus serving and bravely fighting in the field in their behalf; and they suborned one Huntingdon, an Army officer, to impeach him capitally. Who can even hear of the foulness of such ingratitude without a shudder? . . . We should have seen our bold Camillus, on his victorious return from his Scottish expedition, either driven into exile, or put to an ignominious death, had not General Fairfax determined that such a disgrace to his invincible lieutenant was not to be borne, and had not the whole Army, itself also treated ungratefully enough, prevented the atrocity. Entering the City, therefore, the Army quelled the citizens without trouble, and justly removed from the Parliament the partisans of our Scottish enemies; and the remainder of the Parliament, delivered from farther insolent interference on the part of the rabble, cut short the Treaty in the Isle of Wight that had been begun against the resolution and public edict of the House. The accuser, Huntingdon himself, I may add, though nothing was done to him, and he was left to his own conscience, had at last his fit of penitence, and spontaneously asked Cromwell's forgiveness, confessing voluntarily by whom he had been suborned."

A great deal of the interest of the *Defensio Secunda* lies in the passages of Autobiography which it contains. The book is unusually rich in such passages. Here it is, for one thing, that we have that connected chronological sketch of Milton's life by himself which all his biographers have found so useful. To such a sketch, and to much self-reference besides throughout the book, he was forced, it is to be remembered, by the necessity of replying to the gross libels upon his character and career spread through the continent in the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor*. As we have already, however, used every atom of the information contained in the general autobiographic sketch, and have indeed quoted it piece by piece at successive points in our narrative, it will be enough now to quote one or two of the more incidental passages of autobiography or self-defence that occur here and there in the book astray from the general sketch :—

HIS BLINDNESS :—" What nobody but a brute or a barbarian would have done, he upbraids me with my personal appearance and blindness, calling me '*a monster, hideous, ugly, huge, bereft of sight,*' but immediately retracting one of the expressions and saying '*No, 'not huge,' for nothing more puny, pale, and shrivelled than he*' [see ante p. 454].—Though it is not a manly thing to speak of one's personal appearance, yet, as in this matter also I have reason to thank God, I will say a little about it, lest any one should believe (as the common people of Spain, trusting too much to their priests, are apt to fancy of all so-called heretics) that I am some Doghead or Rhinoceros. [Here a few sentences, in which Milton, though admitting he was not of tall stature, repudiates the epithets *puny*, *hideous*, *pale*, and *shrivelled*, as all absurdly inapplicable to him, and adds that at the age of forty-six he retained the fresh complexion and appearance of a man ten years younger, and also that his blindness left his eyes perfectly lucid and unblemished to outward view]. . . .—I wish I could gainsay my brutal adversary in like manner as to the fact of my blindness; but I cannot, and must therefore bear that reproach. It is not miserable to be blind; the misery would be in not being able to bear blindness. But why should I not bear that which every one ought to be prepared to bear in some tolerable manner if it should happen to him, that which may happen too in the natural course of things to any human being alive, and has happened, as I know, to some of the best men known in all history. [Here an enumeration of some of the most illustrious blind persons of history or legend—Tiresias, Phineus, Timoleon of Corinth, Appius Claudius, Caecilius Metellus, the Venetian Dandolo, the Bohemian Ziska, the theologian Jerome Zanchius, the Patriarch Isaac, perhaps also the Patriarch Jacob: ending with a reference to the man blind from birth whom Christ cured, and whose blindness, as Christ declared, was not owing to any sin of his or any sins of his parents.] . . . As for me, I call Thee to witness, O God, the searcher of the inmost heart and of all thoughts of men, that, though I have often and with all my ability inquired into this very matter seriously with myself, and explored all the recesses of my life in the search, I am at this moment conscious to myself of no action of mine, either recent or long past, the atrocity of which can have caused for me, more than others, or deservedly brought upon me, this calamity. As to what I have at any time written (since the Royalists think I am now suffering retribution on that account, and make their boast accordingly), I call God likewise to witness that I never wrote anything of which I was not at the time persuaded, and of which I am not still persuaded, that it was right, true, and pleasing to God, and that I did it not from any prompting of ambition, gain, or glory, but solely for reasons of duty, honour, and loyalty to my country, nor for the liberation of the State only, but also and more especially for the liberation of the Church. [Here occurs the statement that his blindness had been brought on, or hastened, by his deliberate perseverance in his *Defensio Prima pro Populo Anglicano* in spite of the warning of his physicians]. . . Let the calumniators of God's judgments cease, then, to revile me, and to forge their superstitious dreams about me. Let them be assured that I neither regret my lot nor am ashamed of it, that I remain unmoved and fixed in my opinion, that I neither feel nor believe myself an object of God's anger, but actually experience and acknowledge His fatherly mercy and kindness to me in all matters of greatest moment,—especially in that I am able, through His consolation and His strengthening of my spirit, to acquiesce in His divine will, thinking oftener of what He has bestowed upon me than of what He has withheld: finally, that I would not exchange the consciousness of what I have done with that of any deed of theirs, however righteous, or part with my pleasant and always tranquil recollection of the same. As far as blindness is concerned, Morus, I would prefer, if necessary, my blindness to theirs or yours. For yours, drowning the deepest senses, blinds your minds to the perception of what is sound and solid; mine, with which you reproach me, takes away only the colour and surface of things, but removes not from my mental contemplation what is true and steadfast in things themselves. And how many things there are that I would fain not see at all, how many that it is pleasanter for me not to be able to see, how few those others that I should really desire to see! . . . And truly we blind are not the last objects of God's care; for God, the less we are able to behold anything else than Himself, deigns on that very account to regard us the more tenderly and kindly. Woe to him that mocks at us, woe to him that hurts us; he is sure to be an object of public execration; the divine law, the divine favour, makes us not only safe, but almost sacred, from the injuries of men; not so much by the dulling of the eyesight as by the shade of heavenly wings does God seem to have made this darkness for us; and, having made it, He is not seldom wont to illuminate it again by an inner and far more excelling light. To all this I add that my friends also now cherish me, study my wants, favour me with their society, more assiduously even than before, and that there are some from whose lips I can hear, in my walks, those words of true friendship spoken by Pylades to Orestes, and by Theseus to Hercules, in the olden drama:—

'*Orestes:* Go, rudder to my feet.
Pylades: Precious the charge.
Eurip. Orest. (793).'

'*Theseus:* Now give thy hand to thy assisting friend.
Eurip. Herc. Fur. (1398).'

'*Theseus:* Put thy hand on my neck, and I will lead thee.
Ibid. (1402).'

They do not conclude that I am made perfectly useless by this mishap of mine, nor do they think that all that is best and heartiest in a man lies in his eyes. Moreover, the highest men also in the Commonwealth, inasmuch as they know that it was not in the midst of sluggish ease, but in my full activity, and when I was among the foremost in incurring all hazards for liberty, that my eyesight deserted me, do not themselves desert me; but, reflecting on the chances of human life, they favour me, indulge me, as one who has served out his time, grant me vacation and rest. If I have any honourable distinction, they do not strip me of it; if any public office, they do not take it away; if any emolument therefrom, they do not reduce it—kindly judging that, though I am not so useful now as I have been, the provision for me ought not to be less: in short, treating me with as much honour as if, according to the custom of the Athenians of old, they had decreed me public support for my life in the Prytaneum."

The Metrical Libel upon Him (ante pp. 457, 458):—"Poets truly so called I love and honour, and delight in frequently hearing read; and well I know, if I go over the list of such from the very earliest to our own Buchanan, that most of them have been deadly enemies to tyrants. But those millinery-hucksters of verse who can but hate? Nothing foolisher, vainer, corrupter, more mendacious than they. They praise, they revile, without choice, without discrimination, judgment, or measure, now Princes, now Commoners, learned and unlearned together, good or bad, just as they come, according as the quart-pot or the hope of a coin or two, or their idiotic fury, inspires and whirls. I doubt whether the first of our two versifiers in the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor*, if there are two of them [the author of the eulogistic stanzas on Salmasius: ante p. 457], is a poet or a plasterer; he so bedaubs the face of Salmasius, nay whitewashes and harls it as if it were a whole wall. . . . The other does not make verse, but is clearly delirious, madder himself than all the enthusiasts he so rabidly attacks. Playing the part of hangman in the employment of Salmasius, he invokes his strappers, and Cadmus, and I know not what all; then, drunk with hellebore, he disgorges a whole sink of the verbiage of slaves and mountebanks from the Index to Plautus; you would think him speaking some Oscan gibberish rather than Latin, or to be a frog croaking in the hell-marshes he swims in. Then, that you may understand what a craftsman he is in Iambics, he makes two false quantities in one word, lengthening a syllable that should be short, and shortening another that should be long: '*Hi trūcĭdato rege per horrendum nefas.*' Take away, you ass, those panniers of your inanities, and bring instead but three words of sound and sober human sense, if that stupid pumpkin of a head of yours can be wise for a single moment: meanwhile I hand you over, a would-be Orbilius, to the lashing of your own pupils. Go on calling me '*viler than Cromwell*' in your esteem, for it is the greatest compliment you could have paid me."

Of even greater interest in some respects than the passages of autobiography and self-defence in the *Defensio Secunda* are its passages of panegyric on some of Milton's eminent contemporaries.

One of these, which seems quite outrageous in its extravagance now, is addressed to Queen Christina of Sweden. That young Queen, it is to be remembered, had not abdicated her crown when the *Defensio Secunda* was written, though her abdication was then expected, and though it did actually happen before the book was three weeks out (June 16, 1654). She was still the great Amazon of Sweden, famous all over Europe for her abilities, her beauty, her eccentricities, and her patronage of the learned; and the long future bathos of her life, from her abdication and immediate abjuration of Protestantism, on through her wild and disreputable vagabondage on the Continent, and so to her residence in Rome and death there in 1689, was beyond all power of prophecy or calculation. The approbation she had bestowed on the *Defensio Prima*, with the report of her changed behaviour to Salmasius after she had read that book, had made an extraordinary impression on Milton: one may even say that the blaze from Stockholm had dazzled him, and disturbed his judgment.[1] It is singular, at all events, that the most hyperbolic eulogy on anything called woman that ever came from Milton's pen should have been on this splendid Amazonian eccentric of her century, whose whole conduct and education hitherto had been, one would think, a defiance of all Milton's notions and theories about women, and whose future career was to make him blush perhaps for what he had written in her praise, and wish it cancelled. May it not be possible, however, after all, that the greatest blunder of Christina's life was her abdication, and that even now, if she were adequately studied through her whole life, there would be found, even in that long later half of it which seems but disreputable vagabondage and bathos, traits of a shattered, because unsphered, genius? Meanwhile Milton's words about her belong to record, and I am not entitled to omit them.

---

[1] Whitlocke had not returned from his Swedish Embassy when the *Defensio Secunda* appeared; else Milton might have heard from him, or from some of his retinue, confirmations of the previous reports of Queen Christina's high opinion of the *Defensio Prima*. The Queen, it appears, was very inquisitive about eminent persons in England, from Cromwell and his family downwards. "One would have imagined," says Whitlocke, "that England had been her "native country, so well was she fur- "nished with the characters of most "persons of consideration there." She had asked Whitlocke about Selden, Patrick Young, and others, when Whitlocke himself, the conversation turning on eminent Latin writers, "asked her if "she had seen a book lately written in

TO QUEEN CHRISTINA OF SWEDEN.

With what honour, what veneration, O Queen, am I bound for ever to follow you, whose exalted virtue and greatness of soul, not only glorious to yourself, but also fortunate and of happy consequence to me, both freed me from all suspicion and evil reputation among other sovereigns, and laid me under perpetual obligation to yourself by a matchless and immortal favour. How highly ought foreigners to think of your equity and justice, how highly your own people always both to think and to hope, when they have seen you, in a

---

"Latin by one Milton, and how she "liked the style." This was, of course, the *Defensio Prima*; and Whitlocke's report is that "she highly commended the matter of part of it, and the language." Whitlocke had already, in his journey through Sweden to Christina's court, had a singular proof of the celebrity of Milton's book in that country. At a town called Koping, hearing that one of the chief officials had spoken disrespectfully of the English Commonwealth and its chiefs, calling them "tailors and cobblers" who had killed their King, he had thought it right to insist on an inquiry. The Consul or Mayor of the town, and the Prætor or Sub-Mayor, had instantly waited on him, "half drunk for sorrow"—the Prætor (who was the accused party) to explain that it was all a mistake, that he adored the English, and that what he had said was that the Dutch gazettes evidently lied in calling the English Government "tailors and cobblers" when they could send out such a splendid Embassy. "The like," adds Whitlocke, "was at"tested by the Consul, who, for proof "thereof, said that he had read Milton's "book, and liked it, and had it at home" (Whitlocke's Journal of his Swedish Embassy, edition of 1855, Vol. I. p. 273, p. 417, and p. 203). Whitlocke was somewhat annoyed when he found that Hugh Peters had sent a letter on his own account to Christina, through some of the Embassy, with a present of an English mastiff-dog and a big cheese. The Queen, on learning the fact, insisted on having her property, though Whitlocke told her Mr. Peters had presumed "above his station" (*Ibid.* p. 209). Had Peters any Salmasian or Miltonic undermeaning in his mind in sending the English mastiff? See ante p. 319.

matter that seemed to concern your own interests and Majesty itself, judging in that personal business with as little discomposure and as placidly altogether as you are wont to do in any popular suit. Not to no purpose have you collected so many volumes, so many literary relics, acquired from all parts of the world: they cannot perhaps teach yourself anything, but by their means your subjects may learn to appreciate you, and to contemplate the excellence of your valour and wisdom. Unless the very image of this goddess, Wisdom, had been deeply seated in your nature, so as to afford you a kind of ocular vision of herself, by no reading of books could she have excited in you such an incredible passion for her; and hence it is that we the more admire that evidently heavenly vigour of your mind, like some purest portion of the divine breath that has slipped down into those far-distant regions of the earth, where neither the severe and cloudy climate can extinguish or clog it by its frosts and colds, nor has the rugged and sour soil, so often hardening to the genius of its natives, been able to create in you aught unproportioned or rough,—the very ground, on the contrary, rich with so many metals, having proved herself to you a kindly parent, if to others a stepmother, and having, by an exertion of her utmost strength, produced you all golden. I would speak of you as the daughter of Adolphus, sole offspring of an unconquered and famous King, did you not, Christina, outshine him as much as wisdom excels force, and the studies of peace the arts of war. Henceforward surely the Queen of the South will not alone be celebrated: the North also has now her Queen, and one worthy not merely to go forth to hear that wisest King of the Jews, or whoso shall ever be like him, but to be resorted to from all quarters by others as an illustrious exemplar of regal virtues and a Heroine for all eyes—the whole concourse confessing that nowhere on earth is there a temple fit for the praises and deserts of one in whom they discern this as her least distinction, that she is the Queen and Monarch of so many nations. Not the least, however, this—that she also herself feels this to be the least of her honours, and meditates a something far greater and more sublime than reigning: on this very account deserving preference over numberless Kings. She may, then, if such a calamity is reserved for the Swedish nation, abdicate her realm, but the Queen she can never lay aside, having proved herself worthy of the empire not of Sweden only, but of the whole World.

The following paragraphs on the contemporary Englishmen whom Milton most delighted to honour are much more trustworthy than his rhapsody about the Swedish Amazon, and ought not to suffer from being read after it.

BRADSHAW.

JOHN BRADSHAW (a name commended by Liberty herself for everlasting remembrance and celebrity wherever she is cherished) is the scion, as is well known, of an honourable family. He sedulously devoted all his early life to the study of the laws of his country. He was afterwards a most expert and eloquent pleader at the bar, an intrepid advocate of liberty and popular right, employed also in important State-business, and now and then discharging with signal integrity the office of a Judge. At length, having been requested by the Parliament to preside at the King's Trial, he did not decline that dangerous service. For to his knowledge of law he added a liberal disposition, a lofty mind, upright and irreproachable morals: hence he performed and fulfilled that office, more important and more formidable as it was than almost any on record, with such firmness and gravity, such presence of mind and dignity, though exposed to the daggers and threats of so many assassins, that it seemed as if he had been designed and made by Heaven itself for that very work, long ago decreed by God in his marvellous Providence to be done in this nation. Certainly he surpasses in glory all former Tyrannicides in the precise degree in which it is more manly, just, and majestic, to judge a Tyrant than to kill him unjudged. For the rest, neither morose nor austere, but affable and good-tempered, he sustains with complete consistency the great part which he undertook, always equal to himself, and like a consul reelected for another year, so that you would say that he not only judged the King from the tribunal but is judging him all his life. Indefatigable beyond all in Council and in public business, he is there a host in himself. In his own house his hospitality is as splendid for his means as that of any other man in England. The most faithful of friends, and the surest in every turn of fortune, he has no superior in quickness and willingness to recognise merit of whatever kind, and in liberal treatment of the same. Men of piety, men of learning, men known for any kind of talent, military men also, or brave men of any sort that have been reduced to poverty, are all in turn relieved by his bounty; should they not need that relief, they are sure of his esteem and affectionate friendship. He is constantly proclaiming the good points of others, constantly silent about his own. No one more forgiving to political enemies, when any of them come to their senses, as has been the experience of a great many. But, if the cause of any oppressed person is to be openly defended, if the favour or influence of the powerful is to be braved, if the public ingratitude to any deserving man is to be reproached, then no one will miss in him either eloquence or firmness, no one will wish a patron, a friend, more fit, more intrepid, more outspoken : whoever has him for advocate has one whom no threats can make swerve from the right, no fear or bribe can divert from his purpose and duty, or unsettle the steady calmness of his look and soul. Deservedly dear to many for those virtues, and commanding the respect even of his greatest opponents, he has won a name with which will be associated the praise of the great deeds of the Commonwealth among foreigners and posterity through all time to come, after you, Morus, and the like of you, have rotted into oblivion.

FAIRFAX.

Nor is it allowable to pass over you, FAIRFAX, in whom nature and the divine favour have conjoined the highest modesty and purity of life with the most consummate courage. By right and merit you must be called forth for your share in these praises, though now, in that retirement of yours, like Scipio Africanus of old at Liternum, you hide yourself as much as you can, and have conquered not the enemy alone, but also ambition, and that love of glory which conquers sometimes the best of men, and enjoy your virtues and illustrious deeds in that most delightful and glorious rest which is the end of all labours and even of the greatest human actions: such rest as, when it was enjoyed by the ancient heroes after wars and renown not greater than yours, the poets who tried to praise them despaired of being able worthily to represent otherwise than by fabling them to have been received into heaven and to be reclining at the feasts of the gods. But, whether it is, as I would most readily believe, the state of your health, or whether it is anything else, that has withdrawn you from public affairs, of this I am most strongly assured, that nothing could have torn you away from the service of the State unless you had seen what a Saviour of Liberty, what a firm and faithful support and bulwark of the

English Commonwealth, you were leaving in your successor [i. e. in Cromwell].

A CLUSTER OF COMMONWEALTH'S-MEN.

I feel an irresistible impulse to commemorate in my oration the names of some of our most distinguished men. You first, FLEETWOOD, whom I have known, from your very boyhood, onwards to your present post of military honour, the highest next to the Protectorship itself, always the same in humanity, gentleness, and kindliness of spirit, and whose bravery and intrepidity in the field, and yet singular mildness after victory, are acknowledged by the enemy. Next you, LAMBERT, who, when but a young commander, at the head of an inconsiderable force, checked the advance of the Duke of Hamilton, surrounded by the flower and strength of the whole youth of Scotland, and bore his attack after you had checked him. And you, DESBOROUGH, and you, WHALLEY, both of you always found by me, whenever I have heard or read descriptions of the bloodiest battles of this war, in your expected places in the thickest of the fight. Then you, OVERTON, bound to me these many years past in a friendship of more than brotherly closeness and affection, both by the similarity of our tastes and by the sweetness of your manners: you, who in that memorable Battle of Marston Moor, when our left wing was beaten, were seen by the fugitive generals-in-chief, when they looked back to the field, standing firmly with your infantry, and repelling, amid thick carnage on both sides, the assaults of the foe: you, who afterwards, in the Scottish war, under Cromwell's orders, occupied the shores of Fife with your soldiery, and so opened the road to beyond Stirling, and whom the western Scots and the northern Scots now acknowledge as the humanest of enemies, and the distant Orkneys as their conqueror. I will add also some, known to me either by personal friendship or by reputation, who have been called to be members of the Councils of State on account of their distinction in civil business and the arts of peace—WHITLOCKE, PICKERING, STRICKLAND, SYDENHAM, and SIDNEY (which illustrious name I rejoice to see in the list of those who have always adhered to our cause), with MONTAGUE and LAWRENCE, both men of the highest ability and of the best culture and accomplishments.

THE LORD PROTECTOR CROMWELL.

OLIVER CROMWELL is a man of noble and illustrious descent, bearing a name distinguished of old in the State-administration of England when it was under good Kings, and distinguished still more in connexion with the first restoration or establishment among us of the Protestant Religion. To the maturity and full strength of his years, having passed till then a private life, and been known for nothing more than for his attachment to the Puritan form of Religion and the integrity of his behaviour, he had grown up in secret at home, and had nourished in the silence of his own consciousness, for whatever times of crisis were coming, a trustful faith in God and a native vastness of intellect. A Parliament having been at last called by the King, he was returned a member of it by the suffrages of his townsmen, and there became at once a man of mark for the justness of his opinions and the firmness of his advices. When it came to war, his services being in request, he was made captain of a troop of horse; but very soon, his forces having been swelled by the concourse of good men who flocked to his standard from all quarters, he was more heard of than any of the chief commanders both for the greatness of his exploits and his swiftness in executing them. And no wonder. For he was a soldier disciplined to perfection in the knowledge of himself; whatever of an enemy there was within, whether vain hopes, or fears, or desires, he had already either destroyed in his dealings with himself, or brought into subjection; already a self-commander, a self-conqueror, one who had learnt to triumph chiefly over himself, he met the external enemy accordingly,—a veteran from the first day he came into camp, and trained to the last degree in all that hardest kind of camp service. It is impossible for me, within the straitened limits of this discourse, to celebrate with due dignity the incidents of his military career—to speak of the many cities he took, or of the many battles, and some of them great ones, in which, without having been once beaten or foiled, he covered the whole map of Britain with the track of his victories. That were a great work for a real History, and would require over again, as it were, a campaign of speaking, and space for narrative proportioned to the facts. Enough to note this one proof of his unique and almost divine qualifications, that there lived and flourished in him such a strength, whether of mind and genius, or of drilled faculty, not for soldiering alone, but rather for all Christian rule and godliness, that he either attracted to his camp, as to the best school not only of military science, but of religion and piety as well, all who were already good and brave, or made such those who were with him, and mainly by the force of his own example, and that, in all the time of the war, and in the occasional intervals of peace, through so many changes of mood and vicissitudes of affairs, he kept and still keeps the Army to its obedience, not by largesses and military licence, but by authority and bare pay, many difficulties notwithstanding. Greater praise than this has never been bestowed upon Cyrus, or Epaminondas, or any other of the first generals of antiquity . . . So long as you survive, Cromwell, that man has not sufficient trust in God who fears for the sufficient safety of England . . . Let me hasten over the greatest of your recent acts with something, if I can, of your own celerity. All Ireland having been lost to us, with the exception of one city, you, with the army you had sent thither, crushed at once in one battle the strength of the Irish, and were daily putting the rest to rights, when suddenly you were recalled for the war in Scotland. Nothing fatigued, you set out hence against the Scots, when they were preparing an irruption into England with their king; that kingdom, which all our kings in eight hundred years had not been able to subdue, you conquered thoroughly in about one year and annexed to the English dominion; the residue of their forces, still a very strong body and well equipped, having unexpectedly burst into England in the extremity of their despair, when England was almost bare of defence, and having advanced as far as Worcester, you came up with them there by great marches, and destroyed them in one battle, taking prisoners almost the entire nobility of the Scottish nation. From that time to this there has been profound peace at home; and from that time, though not then first, we have had experience that your prowess is not less in political management than in the field. You daily laboured in the Parliament, either for the fulfilment of the engagements made with the enemy or for the settlement of such public questions as were ripe. When you saw delays being contrived, and every one more intent on his private interests than on the public good, and the people complaining of being cheated of their hopes and circumvented by the power of a few, you did what they themselves had so often declined to do when asked, and put an end to their government. Then a new Parliament is called, the election to it being by those fit for the responsibility. Those who were elected meet; they do nothing; after they had long become wearied with dissensions and altercations among themselves, the majority, perceiving that they were neither strong enough nor fit for carrying through the great measures necessary, dissolved themselves by their own act. Thus are we deserted, Cromwell; you alone remain; the sum-total of our affairs has come back to you, and hangs on you alone; we all yield to your insuperable worth, no one having even a word to say to the contrary, unless it be some one who seeks equal honours for himself with an unequal title, or grudges their bestowal on one of higher desert, or understands not that in human society there is nothing more pleasing to God, more agreeable to reason, nothing fairer and more useful to the State, than that the worthiest should bear rule . . . But, inasmuch as, though it is not intrinsically right, it is yet expedient, that the honour accorded to even the highest worth should be defined and bounded by some human designation, you have, by assuming a title likest that of Father of your Country, allowing yourself to be, one cannot say elevated, but rather brought down so many stages from your real sublimity, and as it were forced into rank, for the public convenience. You have, in your far higher majesty, scorned the title of *King*. And surely with justice; for, if in your present greatness you were to be taken with that name which you were able, when a private man, to bring low and reduce obviously to nothing, it would be almost as if, when by the help of the true God you had subdued some idolatrous nation, you were to worship the gods you had yourself overcome. Go on, therefore, in your magnanimous course, O Cromwell; it well becomes you; the liberator of your country, the author of its freedom, and now also the guardian and preserver of the same, you can undertake no more important part, none more august, than your present—you who have excelled by your actions hitherto not only the exploits of Kings, but even the legendary adventures of our Heroes.

The extracts we have presented, and especially the last, prove beyond all doubt that, at the date of the *Defensio Secunda*, Milton was an ardent Oliverian. He positively asserts his approval of all the most contested acts of Cromwell, including not only his forcible dissolution of the Rump and assumption of the Interim Dictatorship, but also his resumption of the Dictatorship, in the form of the Protectorate, after the failure of the Barebones Parliament. Milton, therefore, was one of those persons who did not regard the Protectorate, or modified system of Supreme Magistracy in a Single Person, that person being Cromwell, as inconsistent with genuine Republicanism; and herein he differed from Vane, Bradshaw, Harrison, Marten, Ludlow, and others. Vane, it will have been observed, so highly praised in the Sonnet of 1652, is not named in the *Defensio;* Harrison, Marten, and Ludlow, are also left unnamed; and, though Bradshaw is named, and named nobly, it is without a shade of implied sympathy with his anti-Oliverian politics. It is worth noticing too that, of the fourteen persons named and praised in addition to Cromwell, eight were members of Cromwell's Council and props of his Protectorate, viz. Fleetwood, Lambert, Desborough, Pickering, Strickland, Sydenham, Montague, and Lawrence, while of the other six at least three, though not of the Council, were, in a sufficient sense, Oliverians.

Yet the case is more complex than it looks. It is not without significance that the three persons praised most at length and most heartily, after Cromwell, are Fairfax, Bradshaw, and Overton. Fairfax, indeed, was out of active life, and the compliment to him might be regarded as merely historical and retrospective; but it was different with Bradshaw and Overton. If there was ever to be Parliamentary opposition to the Protector in the interests of a return to the Republicanism of the Rump, Bradshaw was sure to be one of the leaders; and, at the very moment when the *Defensio Secunda* appeared, Colonel Overton was in London, having just been brought from Hull (May 1654), for interrogation as to those circumstances of his recent conduct in Scotland which had led to his recall thence under the idea that he had been favouring a Republican or Anabaptist revolt among the northern soldiery. "Though, my Lord," we find him writing to the Protector, "no "innocency can be so confidently secure but, without betray-"ing itself, it may lawfully wish to stand in the eye of favour, "yet I trust my behaviour hitherto hath been such as, before "disinterested judges, will bear me up against the reports or "misrepresentations of all delators. If any expressions have, "through the freedom which we fought for, fallen from me, "I shall desire no more ingenuity in my adversaries' constructions than what my fourteen years' faithful services "will warrant me to claim. But such, my Lord, is my misfortune that I am yet kept hoodwinked as to the cause of "my attendance, and all that I can grope out in this darkness "is that my condition resembles that of Cremutius in Tacitus: "*Verba mea arguuntur, adeo factorum sum innocens.*"[1]—There was courage, therefore, in the unstinted expression, at that moment, of Milton's extraordinary regard for Bradshaw and Overton; or rather—for Cromwell was the last man to resent such fidelity to private friendship—there may have been subtle and generous design. By such superlative praise of Bradshaw and Overton in a pamphlet avowedly Oliverian, was it not hinted to Oliver that Milton, and many others in England, hoped he would rather conciliate such men than alienate them farther; and, by the conjunction of their names in the pamphlet with those of so many of Oliver's Councillors and adherents, and with the theme of Oliver's own unparalleled greatness, was it not hinted to themselves that their separation from Oliver would be a mistake? In short, was it not virtually asked whether this Pamphlet might not typify that Commonwealth of the Protectorate which it defended, and whether men who could be honestly and honourably brought together in the one might not honestly and honourably cooperate in the other?

If this was Milton's design, he had, in Overton's case at least, some immediate success. While the pamphlet was on Milton's table in Petty France, Overton must have been visiting him there, and often conversing with him confidentially; and it is not impossible that Milton's private arguments in these colloquies with his friend may have aided those of his public pamphlet. Overton, at all events, precisely when he was thus once more in Milton's society, did come to an understanding with Cromwell. The purport of the understanding was that he should consider himself under pledge to serve the Protector in good faith until he should himself give notice that he could do so no longer. In a conversation with Cromwell Overton had said that, if he "perceived his Lordship did only design the setting up of himself, and not the good of these nations," then he could not continue to serve him. "Thou wert a knave if thou wouldst" had been Cromwell's reply; and so the matter rested.[1] Accordingly, in Sept. 1654, three months after the *Defensio Secunda* had been published, Overton was back in Scotland in full favour, as Major-General Overton, second in command to Monk. Milton may have congratulated himself on that result, and imagined that thenceforward his friend was secure.

---

[1] Thurloe, III. 67. The letter is not dated there; but the expressions prove it to have been written at the date assumed—say in May or June 1654. Cremutius Cordus was a Roman historian, impeached in the reign of Tiberius for words in praise of Brutus and Cassius and in dispraise of Imperialism.

If Cromwell read the *Defensio Secunda*, however, he would notice other things in it, besides the bold eulogies on Bradshaw and Overton. He would notice that the magnificent general approbation which it had pleased his Latin Secretary Extraordinary to bestow on his career, policy, and Protectorship, was by no means unqualified, and indeed that this Latin Secretary Extraordinary of his was a very independent kind of person, not muzzled in the least by his £288 a year. The pamphlet is not an adulation of the Protectorate in all respects. It contains distinct reservations in Milton's own name, and in the interest of his own political convictions. These appear in various incidental passages, but chiefly in certain direct advices and appeals to Cromwell, inwrought with the great Panegyric on him, and in an eloquent closing address to the English people generally.

The sum and substance of Milton's advice to Cromwell is that he should beware of the temptations to arbitrariness and self-will to which his high post exposed him, and not belie his past career by offences against LIBERTY. "Reflect often," he says to Cromwell, "what a dear thing, and of how dear "parentage, this Liberty is that has been commended and "entrusted to you by your country, and that you now hold in

---

[1] Letter of Overton's: Thurloe, III. 110.

"your hands: what she lately looked for from the elect representatives of the whole nation she now looks for from you "alone, hopes to obtain through you alone: revere this great "expectation, this sole hope of your country concerning you." Again, "Truly, you cannot yourself be free without us; for it "is an arrangement of Nature that whosoever entrenches on "the liberty of others loses his own first of all." Again, "If "one who has been the patron and as it were tutelary God of "Liberty, if he than whom none among us is reckoned more "just, more saintly, or a better man, should afterwards invade "the Liberty he has defended, it can hardly be but that the result would be disastrous and deadly not only to himself, but "also to the universal interests of virtue and piety." LIBERTY, always LIBERTY, is, therefore, the word with Milton. And yet, when we come to analyse what he practically meant under this vague word LIBERTY, there is much to surprise our modern ideas.

One might hastily suppose, for example, that what Milton meant in his earnest appeals to Cromwell not to use his power to the detriment of Liberty was that he should call full, free, and frequent Parliaments, and govern constitutionally by their advice. Nothing could be farther from the fact. By the constituting instrument of the Protectorate, a Parliament was to meet on the 3rd of September, 1654; and, as the writs for this Parliament were issued June 1, or only two days after the *Defensio Secunda* was published, Milton can have had no doubt, while he was writing, that the Parliament would assemble duly on the day fixed. But there is no sign of eagerness on his part for this coming Parliament, or of anxiety for the regular succession of subsequent Triennial Parliaments also promised by the Instrument. On the contrary, one perceives, throughout the whole of the closing address to the English People, a kind of dread of the approaching Parliamentary Election, and an anxiety to disabuse his countrymen of the idea that Liberty consisted in the recurrence of such elections. Here are a few of the most characteristic sentences:—

For it is of no small consequence, O my countrymen, whether for the acquisition or for the retention of Liberty, what sort of persons you are yourselves . . . Unless by true and sincere piety towards God and men, not vain and wordy, but efficacious and active, you drive from your souls all superstitions sprung from ignorance of true and solid religion, you will always have those who will make you their beasts of burden and sit upon your backs and necks; they will put you up for sale as their easily gotten booty, all your victories in war notwithstanding, and make a rich income out of your ignorance and superstition. Unless you expel avarice, ambition, luxury, from your minds, ay and luxurious living also from your families, then the tyrant you thought you had to seek externally and in the battle-field you will find in your own home, you will find within yourselves, a still harder task-master; nay, there will sprout daily out of your own vitals a numerous brood of intolerable tyrants . . . Were you fallen into such an abyss of easy self-corruption, no one, not Cromwell himself, nor a whole host of Brutuses, if they could come to life again, could deliver you if they would, or would deliver you if they could. For why should any one then assert for you the right of free suffrage, or the power of electing whom you will to the Parliament? Is it that you should be able, each of you, to elect in the cities men of your faction, or that person in the burghs, however unworthy, who may have feasted yourselves most sumptuously, or treated the country people and boors to the greatest quantity of drink? Then we should have our members of Parliament made for us not by prudence and authority, but by faction and feeding; we should have vintners and hucksters from city-taverns, and graziers and cattle-men from the country districts. Should one entrust the Commonwealth to those to whom nobody would entrust a matter of private business? . . . Know that, as to be free is the same thing exactly as to be pious, wise, just, temperate, self-providing, abstinent from the property of other people, and, in fine, magnanimous and brave, so to be the opposite of all this is the same as being a slave; and by the customary judgment of God, and a thoroughly just law of retribution, it comes to pass that a nation that cannot rule and govern itself, but has surrendered itself in slavery to its own lusts, is surrendered also to other masters, whom it does not like, and made a slave not only with its will but also against its will. It is a thing ratified by law and nature herself that whosoever cannot manage himself, whosoever through imbecility or phrenzy of mind cannot rightly administer

> his own affairs, should not be in his own power, but should be given over as a minor to the government of others; and least of all should such an one be preferred to influence in other people's business or in the Commonwealth.

The Liberty which Milton adjured Cromwell to respect in his Protectorate was not, therefore, mere Parliamentary Constitutionalism; much less was it an extension of the suffrage beyond the basis laid down in the Instrument of the Protectorate. As Cromwell had taken freedoms with Parliaments before, so, as far as Milton was concerned, he was welcome to take freedoms with them again; and, as Cromwell believed that the suffrage for the time being should not be, and could not be, in the hands of all and sundry, but only in the hands of the "honest party," to the same effect was Milton willing to declare himself. What, then, was the peculiar Miltonic Liberty hinted at as possibly in peril under the Protectorate of Cromwell? The following passage of the address to Cromwell supplies the answer:—

> You have undertaken a most heavy task, which will search you through and through, sift and reveal you wholly and intimately, show what soul is in you, what strength, what weight—whether there really live in you that piety, faith, justice, and moderation of mind, for which we believe you to have been raised in preference to others, by God's appointment, to this topmost dignity. To rule by your counsel three powerful nations, to try to lead their peoples from bad habits to a better economy and discipline of life than they have known hitherto, to send your anxious thoughts all over the country to its most distant parts, to watch, to foresee, to refuse no labour, to spurn all blandishments of pleasure, to avoid the ostentation of wealth and power, these are difficulties in comparison with which war is but sport; these will shake and winnow you; these demand a man upheld by divine aid, warned and instructed almost by direct intercourse with heaven. All which and more I doubt not but you often think of with yourself and revolve in your mind, as also by what means you may best be able to effect those great ends, and at the same time make Liberty safe and even enlarge it. And this, in my opinion, you will hardly accomplish better in any other way than by first of

all associating with you, as you now do, among the foremost partners in your counsels, those who have been the companions of your labours and trials, men certainly of the highest modesty, integrity, and valour. [Here follows the passage in which Fleetwood, Lambert, Desborough, Whalley, Overton, Whitlocke, Pickering, Strickland, Sydenham, Sidney, Montague, and Lawrence, are grouped together for praise, the purpose being, as it were, to introduce them to Cromwell as specimens of the kind of men Milton likes to see, or would like to see, associated with him]. . . . Next, if you leave the Church to the Church, and discreetly rid yourself and the magistracy of that burden, actually half of the whole and at the same time most incompatible with the rest, not allowing two powers of utterly diverse natures, the Civil and the Ecclesiastical, to commit fornication together, and by their promiscuous and delusive helps apparently to strengthen, but in reality to weaken and finally subvert, each other; if also you take away all persecuting power from the Church—for persecuting power will never be absent so long as money, the poison of the Church, the strangler of Truth, shall be extorted by force from the unwilling, as a pay for preaching the Gospel;—then you will have cast out of the Church those moneychangers that truckle not with doves, but with the Dove itself, the Holy Ghost. Then if you do not enact so many new laws as you abolish old ones; for there are often in a State people who have the same itch for passing a multiplicity of laws that some versifiers have for producing many poems. Laws are generally worse in proportion to their number; and you will do well therefore to retain only the massive and necessary crags and not the small precautions, removing all laws that impose the same restrictions on the good as on the bad, or such as, while perhaps they guard against the frauds of the evil-disposed, forbid what ought to be free to the good, but keeping those that concern real vices only, and that do not prohibit things licit in themselves on account of the abuse of them by some. For Laws are provided only for the restraint of positive crime, and Liberty is the best former and increaser of virtue. Next, if you make better provision than has been made hitherto for the education and moral training of youth, not thinking it right that the docile and the indocile, the diligent and the idle, should be brought up together at the public expense, but reserving the rewards of learning for those who are already learned and already meritorious. Then if you allow such as wish to philosophise freely to publish whatever they have on hand at their own risk, without the private examination of any little man in authority; for then Truth will flourish most, and it will not be eternally the censorship of half-scholars, or their ill-will, or their littleness of mind, or their factitious respect for others, that shall measure out all science by their own small standards, and impart it to us at their own discretion. Finally, if you yourself shall not dread to hear any truth or any falsehood, whatever it is, but shall listen least of all to those who do not think themselves free unless they can prevent others from being free—those who are studious and vehement for nothing so much as for putting fetters upon the consciences as well as upon the bodies of their brethren, and for bringing both into the State and into the Church the worst of all tyrannies, whether that of their own depraved habits or that of their silly opinions. From such you will do well to stand aloof, siding rather with those who think that not their own sect or faction only, but all citizens equally, ought to enjoy equal rights of freedom in the State.—Should the Liberty here described, and which it is in the power of the rulers of the State to grant, seem insufficient to any one, I judge such a person to be a favourer rather of ambition and of turbulence than of genuine Liberty, especially at a time when the condition of the population itself, agitated by so many factions, as after a storm when the waves have not subsided, does not admit the ideal and perfect system of things.

Throwing this passage into systematic form, we see that Milton's advices to Cromwell for his conduct in the Protectorate were mainly six:—(1) Reliance on a pretty broad Council of well-selected Associates; (2) Immediate or Rapid Church-Disestablishment, with abolition of Tithes and of every other form of connexion between Church and State, and a Return in Religious matters to the system of absolute Voluntaryism; (3) Caution against Over-Legislation generally, with a Repeal of all Laws restrictive of people in their ordinary amusements and dealings, even when the restrictions might seem in the interest of morality;[1] (4) Revision of

---

[1] In connexion with this particular caution see the list of Cromwell's eighty-two Ordinances between Dec. 1653 and Sept. 1654, ante pp. 558—565.

University and Scholastic Endowments, with a view to converting them into prizes to be bestowed late in the academic career, and for merit already ascertained; (5) Complete Liberty for Speculation and Publication, and Abolition of every vestige of Censorship over the Press; (6) Inclination always in every matter to the generous view of things rather than to the persecuting and repressive.

To most of this, so frankly spoken out by Milton, and yet with such studious delicacy in the wording, Cromwell's attitude, as far as one can see, must have been that of entire and smiling assent. He could but have thanked Mr. Milton most respectfully for his advices, as well as for the splendid Panegyric in which they were imbedded, and assured Mr. Milton that he appreciated them and would remember them. And yet, on the whole, one discerns a difference between the actual Cromwellian policy and that recommended by Milton. It may be expressed by saying that Cromwell was now, on the whole, more of the Conservative, with faith in interference and regulation, while Milton was still, on the whole, more of the modern Radical, with faith in Liberty and *Laissez-faire*. Perhaps, however, in one point only did the difference between them amount to positive contrariety or antagonism. This was No. 2 of the preceding list, or the Question of a State-Church. In nothing can Cromwell have so much disappointed Milton as in his recent zeal for the conservation of a State-paid Ministry. Two years ago, in the Sonnet beginning "*Cromwell, our chief of men*," what had been Milton's special adjuration to Cromwell?

"Help us to save free conscience from the paw
Of Hireling Wolves, whose Gospel is their maw."

This, properly interpreted, means that it had been to Cromwell that Milton then looked for what he considered the greatest possible service to Liberty that yet remained to be done in the Commonwealth—to wit, the utter Disestablishment of the Church and the absolute dissociation of Religion in future

---

Not half of these Ordinances had been passed when the *Defensio Secunda* was finished; but Milton may have noted already Cromwell's legislative activity and the restrictive character of some of his Ordinances.

from the business of the Civil Magistracy. Since then Cromwell's opinions on that subject had either undergone unexpected development or had revealed themselves more distinctly; and now one of the avowed characteristics of the Protectorate was the Protector's own determination that the Propagation of the Gospel belonged expressly to the duty of the Civil Magistrate, and consequently that, while there might be Voluntary or Missionary Preachers, there must also be a State-paid and State-controlled Clergy. The greatest stumbling-block to Milton in the arrangements of the Protectorate was, I believe, this matter of Cromwell's Established Church. Here, if in nothing else, he was at one with the wildest Anabaptist critics of the Protectorate. Take, by way of additional confirmation, just one other passage from the *Defensio Secunda*. It occurs by itself, not at all in connexion with the direct address to Cromwell, but merely by way of reply to a stray observation in the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor* to the effect that the English Revolutionists had not only abolished Episcopacy, but also impoverished the Church, and starved the parochial clergy.

THE ESTABLISHED CLERGY OF THE COMMONWEALTH.

In other countries perhaps there has been poor provision for the Clergy, but with us enough and more than enough. Our Clergy are rather to be called Sheep than Shepherds; they are the fed rather than the pastors; all in general is fat about them, even their intellects not excepted. They are pampered with tithes in a manner disapproved by all other Churches, and they have so little trust in God that they prefer extorting a maintenance from their flocks by force and magisterial power to being indebted for the same either to Divine Providence or to the benevolence and gratitude of their congregations. All the while too they are so frequently at the tables of their disciples of both sexes that they hardly know what dining at home or supping at home means. Hence for the most part they live in luxury rather than in want, and their children and wives vie in extravagance and finery with the children and wives of the rich. To have increased this luxury by large new endowments would have been quite the same thing as to have infused a new poison into the Church, and so perpetrated over again that pestilential act which was lamented long ago in Constantine's time by a voice from heaven.

Presentation-copies of the *Defensio Secunda* appear to have been sent by Milton to all the persons named in the book, and to a good many more. One would like, above all, to trace the presentation-copy to Cromwell, and to see him turning over the pages, and trying to make out, here and there, a bit of the troublesome Latin. That pleasure is denied us; but, by means of one interesting letter that has survived, we can trace three of the other presentation-copies to their destinations. The writer of the letter is no other than Andrew Marvell.

Our last certain glimpse of Marvell was in February, 1652–3, when Milton introduced him by letter to Bradshaw, with a view to having him brought in as assistant to himself in the Latin Secretaryship in succession to Mr. Weckherlin. Cromwell's dissolution of the Rump Government, two months afterwards, had frustrated that proposal; and the person actually brought in, when Cromwell was Dictator, was not Marvell, but Meadows. The appointment of Meadows to full duty, with £200 a year of salary, was made in October 1653 by the First Council of the Barebones Parliament; but he had already been doing Latin translations on trial, at a smaller salary, under Thurloe, for Cromwell's Interim Council of Thirteen, i. e. before July 1653. Precisely at the time, however, when Marvell was thus disappointed of a post which would have associated him with Milton under Cromwell's Government, he was brought into relation with Cromwell of a more private kind.

There was a certain boy, named William Dutton, of whom Cromwell was then taking a kind of fatherly charge. He was the elder son and heir of a Sir Ralph Dutton, of Gloucestershire, who had been Gentleman of the Privy Chamber Extraordinary to Charles I., and an ardent Royalist in the Civil Wars, till his death, in 1646, at Burntisland in Scotland,—to which port a ship in which he had embarked at Leith, in order to escape to France, had been driven back by stress of weather. The boy seems then to have been adopted by his uncle, John Dutton, of Sherborne, in Gloucestershire, Esq., an elder brother of Sir Ralph, and described as "one of the richest men in the kingdom." This John Dutton had been one of the members for Gloucestershire in the Long Parliament, and for some time rather Parliamentarian in his politics, but had at length joined the King at Oxford, and had consequently been disabled and heavily fined for delinquency. Like many others in similar circumstances, he had now welcomed the dissolution of the Rump by Cromwell, and had accepted Cromwell's personal Dictatorship as the best form of government possible for the Commonwealth. His adhesion to Cromwell, indeed, was one not of form only, but of private intimacy and friendship; it is possible even that there may have been some link of kinship. In Mr. Dutton's will, when he died, at all events, there was to be found this remarkable paragraph, relating to his orphan-nephew:—"I "humbly request and desire that his Highness the Lord "Protector will be pleased to take upon him the guardianship "and disposal of my nephew William Dutton, and of that "estate I by deed of settlement have left him, and that his "Highness will be pleased, in order to my former desires, and "according to the discourse that hath passed betwixt us "thereupon, that, when he shall come to ripeness of age, a "marriage may be had and solemnized betwixt my said "nephew, William Dutton, and the Lady Frances Cromwell, "his Highness's youngest daughter; which I much desire, "and, if it take effect, shall account it as a blessing from God." The date of the will is Jan. 14, 1655–6, and the testator lived to 1657, while the precise time with which we are now concerned is but July 1653, when Cromwell was not yet Lord Protector, but only Interim Dictator. It would seem, however, that the understanding expressed in Mr. Dutton's will must have fully existed between him and Cromwell even at this earlier date, by the "discourse betwixt" them to which the will refers, and so that in July 1653, Cromwell, regarding the boy Dutton as his possible son-in-law, had good reason to take a "fatherly" charge of him. In all such domestic matters Cromwell was most exemplary; and, amid all his occupations after the Dissolution of the Rump, he had found time to make what seemed to him the best possible arrangement for the education of the youth (in delicate health, apparently) in whom he was so closely interested.—At Eton or Windsor, by recent appointment to one of the Fellowships of Eton College, where Milton's friend, the good Sir Henry Wotton, had once been Provost, there then lived a John Oxenbridge, M.A., about forty-eight years of age, well known and highly respected among the Independents and Sectaries. As long ago as 1634 he had lost his fellowship in Magdalen College, Oxford, on account of his "schismatic Puritanism"; he had been in the Bermudas; he had returned to England in 1641 or 1642, and had gone about in different parts of the country, "preaching very enthusiastically," and undergoing many hardships, for which his present comfortable preferment was thought by his admirers only a just compensation,—though it was to turn out, after all, only a temporary resting-place in his chequered career, and he was to lose it at the Restoration, wander over the world again, and die in New England at last. His wife, much older than himself, and now dropsical and "swollen beyond the measure of the human frame," had accompanied him in his Bermudas exile, and in all his tours of preaching since his return, "herself the greatest glory of his ministry, and with primitive modesty plying the same successful pursuit of souls at home as he abroad," i. e. preaching privately. They had four children, but whether all living with them is uncertain. At all events, they had room in their household for a boarder; and such was Cromwell's opinion of the Oxenbridges, husband and wife, that he had resolved to place young Mr. Dutton with them for a year or two.—Young Mr. Dutton did not go alone to Eton, however, to live with the Oxenbridges. There went with him a tutor of Cromwell's choosing; and this tutor was no other than Andrew Marvell. By what means he had been recommended to Cromwell we do not know. Milton may have helped, or it may have been recommendation enough to have been in Fairfax's house, and tutor for some time to Fairfax's young daughter. Marvell, at any rate, seems to have been pleased with the appointment, and to have been very anxious to discharge his trust to Cromwell's satisfaction. There is a letter of his, dated "Windsor, July 28, 1653," and addressed "For his Excellency The Lord General Cromwell these, with my most humble service," in which he thanks Cromwell for the confidence placed in him, announces the arrival of himself and young Mr. Dutton in their new abode, and gives his first impressions of his pupil. He is just getting acquainted with him, he says, and, having examined him several times, finds him a promising youth, "of gentle and waxen disposition," very modest, and yet easily spurred. "And the care," adds Marvell, "which your Excellency is pleased to take of him is "no small encouragement, and shall be so represented to him. "But, above all, I shall labour to make him sensible of his "duty to God; for then we begin to serve faithfully, when "we consider that He is our master. And in this both he "and I owe infinitely to your Lordship, for having placed us "in so godly a family as that of Mr. Oxenbridge, whose doctrine and example are like a book and a map, not only instructing the ear, but demonstrating to the eye, which way "we ought to travel. And Mrs. Oxenbridge hath a great "tenderness over him also in all other things. She has "looked so well to him that he hath already much mended "his complexion; and she is now busy ordering his chamber, "that he may delight to be in it as often as his studies "require."—The change must have been considerable to Marvell from Fairfax's fine Yorkshire mansion of Nunappleton, and the teaching of the tongues to young Mary Fairfax; but he and Mr. Dutton appear to have got on pleasantly enough together in the peculiarly pious household of the Oxenbridges, liking Mr. Oxenbridge himself more and more, and respecting more and more the dying Mrs. Oxenbridge. It was something for Marvell to be near London, and, though he had lost the Assistant-Secretaryship to Milton, to be in such relations to Cromwell as could not fail to keep him in that great man's remembrance for any future chance of public employment.[1]

---

[1] For the facts about young Mr. Dutton and his connexions my authority is Noble's *Protectoral House of Cromwell* (ed. 1787), I. 153—4. Marvell's

Marvell had been somewhat less than a year in his tutorship of young Mr. Dutton at Eton, domiciled with the Oxenbridges, when Milton's *Defensio Secunda* appeared. Three early copies of the book had been sent to him there by a messenger, with a letter from Milton explaining that one of the copies was for himself, and another for Mr. Oxenbridge, but requesting him to see very particularly to the delivery of the third copy, together with a letter accompanying that copy. Marvell had attended to the commission at once, and sent back intimation to that effect in writing by the messenger. Not quite to Milton's satisfaction, however, as will appear from Marvell's second letter on the subject, which has fortunately been preserved :—

"For my most Honoured Friend, John Milton, Esquire, Secretary for the Foreign Affairs, at his House in Petty France, Westminster.

Honoured Sir,

I did not satisfy myself in the account I gave you of presenting your Book to my Lord, although it seemed to me that I writ you all which the messenger's speedy return the same night from Eton would permit me ; and I perceive that, by reason of that haste, I did not give you satisfaction, neither, concerning the delivering of your Letter at the same time. Be pleased, therefore, to pardon me, and know that I tendered them both together. But my Lord read not the letter while I was with him; which I attributed to our despatch [hurry] and some other business tending thereto—which I

Letter to Cromwell is in Nickoll's *Milton Papers* (1743), pp. 98—99 ; also in Marvell's Correspondence, as edited by Mr. Grosart in his edition of Marvell's Works (Vol. II. pp. 3—5). There is a somewhat ill-natured account of the Oxenbridges in Wood (Ath. III. 1026—1028) ; but Mr. Grosart, in his notes to Marvell's Letter, as above, gives farther particulars, and quotes in full from Le Neve the long Latin Epitaph on Mrs. Oxenbridge which once existed on a black marble set up to her memory by her husband in Eton College Chapel after her death in April 1655. The Epitaph was written by Marvell. I have quoted phrases from it in the text : e. g. that about her dropsy. There must be an error, however, in Le Neve's copy of the Epitaph, or in Mr. Grosart's transcript from it, inasmuch as "April 1653" is there given as the date of her death. In that case she could not have been the Mrs. Oxenbridge who received Marvell and Dutton in July 1653, and was so motherly in her attention to Mr. Dutton. To be sure, there was a second Mrs. Oxenbridge, a daughter of the Puritan Hezekiah Woodward, already known to us (Vol. III. 231); but she can hardly have been in the house three months after the death of the first. Wood distinctly gives the death of the first Mrs. Oxenbridge as in "April 1655," and adds that Oxenbridge married his second wife "before he had remained a widower a year." In this point I have assumed Wood to be right.

therefore wished ill to so far as it hindered an affair much better and of greater importance: I mean that of reading your Letter. And, to tell you truly mine own imagination, I thought that he would not open it while I was there, because he might suspect that I, delivering it just upon my departure, might have brought in it some second proposition like to that which you had before made to him by your Letter to my advantage [see ante pp. 478, 479]. However, I assure myself that he has since read it, and *you* that he did then witness all respect to your person, and as much satisfaction concerning your Work as could be expected from so cursory a review and so sudden an account as he could then have of it from me.

Mr. Oxenbridge, at his return from London, will, I know, give you thanks for *his* [copy of your] book, as *I* do with all acknowledgment and humility for that you have sent *me.* I shall now study it, even to the getting of it by heart, esteeming it, according to my poor judgment (which yet I wish it were so right in all things else), as the most compendious scale, for so much, to the height of the Roman Eloquence. When I consider how equally it turns and rises, with so many figures, it seems to me a Trajan's Column, in whose winding ascent we see embossed the several monuments of your learned victories. And Salmasius and Morus make up as great a triumph as that of Decebalus; whom too, for aught I know, you shall have forced, as Trajan the other, to make themselves away out of a just desperation.

I have an affectionate curiosity to know what becomes of Colonel Overton's business, and am exceeding glad that Mr. Skinner is got near you, the happiness of which I at the same time congratulate to him and envy—there being none who doth, if I may so say, more jealously honour you than,

Honoured Sir,
Your most affectionate humble Servant,
Eton: June 2, 1654. Andrew Marvell."[1]

The "my Lord" of this Letter was, as the allusions in it will have suggested, almost certainly Ex-President Bradshaw. He seems then to have been staying at or near Eton; and, as Milton was naturally anxious that the book should reach *him* at once and in a proper manner, he had sent it through Marvell in the way indicated. Marvell had done as requested; but, his interview with Bradshaw having been interrupted by other business, he had been able to send only a vague report back to Milton that day by the messenger—the rather (as he imagined) because Bradshaw, suspecting that the letter which accompanied the book might contain a renewed proposal of official employment for Marvell, had judiciously kept it unopened till Marvell should be gone. Hence the second and supplementary report just quoted. One may guess that Milton would not have shown so much curiosity about Marvell's interview with Bradshaw had not his letter to Bradshaw been one of some delicacy and importance. As Milton's book, though with a noble passage of eulogy on Bradshaw himself, was decidedly Oliverian, or in defence of the Protectorate, may not Milton have been dubious how he would thenceforth stand, on that account, in Bradshaw's opinion? All we really know is that the good relations between Bradshaw and Milton hitherto did not suffer. It was a time when the best friends had to allow the question of adhesion to the Protectorate to be an open one among themselves, even the oppositionists not being quite sure of their own perseverance. Besides, what man could read a Eulogy on himself like Milton's on Bradshaw without a sense of obligation?

---

[1] Ayscough MSS., Brit. Mus., No. 4292, pp. 120—121; where it is attested by "J. Owen" as "a true and exact copy of an original letter from Mr. Marvell." I do not retain the old spelling.

A point of incidental interest in Marvell's letter is its reference to "Colonel Overton's business." What that was, and how Milton was connected with it (ante p. 552 and pp. 606, 607), we already know. Of greater novelty is the mention of "Mr. Skinner" as having "got near" Milton, and as half-congratulated and half-envied by Marvell on that account. Here, in fact, we have the reappearance about Milton in Petty France of his old pupil of the Aldersgate Street days, CYRIACK SKINNER (Vol. III. pp. 657–658). Since those days we hardly know what Skinner had been doing; but he was now a gentleman of considerable means, and of inquisitive scientific and political tastes, eight and twenty years of age or thereabouts, who had taken up his residence in London, in or near Lincolns Inn, with plenty of leisure on his hands, much of which he was ready to bestow on his former instructor, now blind Mr. Secretary Milton. It is possible, we may here add, that Marvell's own first introduction to Milton may have been owing to Cyriack Skinner, and not, as we formerly surmised, to Fairfax. There was, indeed, an old and intimate relationship between Marvell's family and Skinner's. Thornton College in Lincolnshire, the seat of Skinner's progenitors, is not far from Hull in Yorkshire, where Marvell had been brought up, and is separated from it only by the Humber; various scions of the Skinner family had made Hull their head-quarters; and it is still told in the Histories of Hull how Andrew Marvell's father, the minister of Hull, met his death by drowning in 1640, when crossing the Humber in a boat, in company with "Madam Skinner of Thornton College" and two beautiful young persons whose wedding he was about to perform. Local legend adds that the mother of this Madam Skinner had adopted young Marvell, and provided for him, after his father's death.[1]

Whatever was Marvell's occupation for the present at Eton, there is proof that neither he nor Milton had given up the hope that they might yet be associated officially in Westminster. Mr. Meadows, indeed, was now definitely Milton's substitute in the Foreign Secretaryship; but there might soon be changes in the office that would make an opening for Marvell. One may say that Marvell had been calculating on this possibility and qualifying himself for it. He had recently, for example, written three pieces of Latin verse, which could be pointed to as specimens of what he could do in the sub-laureateship to Milton on official occasions. The first was a longish poem in Elegiacs, addressed "*Doctori Ingelo, cum Domino Whitlocke, ad Reginam Sueciæ Delegato a Protectore, Residenti, Epistola*": "To Dr. Ingelo, residing with Lord Whitlocke, Ambassador from the Protector to the Queen of Sweden." Though, in form, a poem of private friendship, inquiring how Dr. Ingelo, Chaplain to the Swedish Embassy, is faring in the cold Swedish climate, it is really a political poem, celebrating the Protector's alliance with Sweden, and it contains an encomium on Queen Christina, very much like Milton's extravagant prose Eulogy on that Queen in the *Defensio Secunda*, with a special account of the impression produced on Marvell by a sight of her portrait. About the same time that Marvell had seen this portrait of Christina he had seen a new one of Cromwell; and the second of the three Latin pieces is a distich on that Portrait, entitled "*In Effigiem Oliveri Cromwelli*": "On a Portrait of Oliver Cromwell." But the Portrait, it seems, was intended as a present to Queen Christina; and, to suit that fact, Marvell had furnished, asked or unasked, an additional little piece, entitled "*In Eandem, Reginæ Sueciæ Transmissam*": "On the same, sent to the Queen of Sweden." The lines, which are supposed to be spoken by Cromwell himself to the Queen, are as follows:—

---

[1] Grosart's "Memorial Introduction" prefixed to his edition of Marvell's Works, pp. xxxi—xxxiii.

> "Bellipotens Virgo, Septem regina Trionum,
> Christina, Arctoi lucida stella poli,
> Cernis quas merui durâ sub casside rugas,
> Utque senex armis impiger ora fero,
> Invia fatorum dum per vestigia nitor,
> Exequor et Populi fortia jussa manu:
> Ast tibi submittit frontem reverentior umbra;
> Nec sunt hi vultus Regibus usque truces."

Milton, in his capacity of Latin Secretary, might have written this, had Cromwell wanted any trifle of the kind from his pen; nay, the lines do generally pass as Milton's, written to order for the Protector, and are accordingly included in all the modern Editions of Milton's Latin Poems; yet they are, beyond a doubt, Marvell's. They appeared first in print distinctly as Marvell's; they are closely connected, in subject and expression, with the two preceding pieces, which have never been claimed as Milton's; and they were surmised to be Milton's by mistake long after he and Marvell were both dead. The mistake, however, has a certain historical significance. Marvell, at the time when he wrote the three pieces, i. e. just about our present date, was Milton's *attaché*, whom he desired to bring forward; may it not then have pleased Milton to be able to say of such lines as those on

Cromwell's Portrait, if there were any inquiries about the authorship: "Call them mine, if you like; but they are Mr. Marvell's." In every way Marvell was recommending himself more and more, and perhaps not without the Protector's cognisance, as a fit man to succeed Meadows in the co-Secretaryship with Milton, should there be occasion. Always honestly an admirer of Cromwell, even while he could hardly explain that admiration to himself, or reconcile it with his regrets for the abolished Monarchy and the sad fate of Charles (see ante pp. 476–478), he had become now in all points an Oliverian and enthusiast for the Protectorate. His discipleship to Milton was complete even in this respect. "Discipleship" I call it, in order to make more precise at this point the nature of that connexion between Milton and Marvell which has been left too vague hitherto in English tradition. We have had the facts before us so far. Sixteen months ago, Milton, in recommending Marvell to Bradshaw for public employment, had spoken of him generously as a person of such ability and merit that it might hardly be to his own advantage, however advantageous it might be for the public service, to have him for a coadjutor. And yet now Marvell, writing to Milton, writes with fear and trembling as to some tremendous superior. He is afraid that he has not performed Mr. Milton's small commission to Mr. Milton's entire satisfaction; he envies Mr. Skinner his present privilege of being so much in Mr. Milton's society; he tells Mr. Milton he means to get his *Defensio Secunda* by heart, and says it reminds him of nothing so much as of Trajan's Column.[1]

Among the foreigners to whom Milton sent presentation-copies of his *Defensio Secunda* was a certain Henry Oldenburg. He was a native of Bremen in Lower Saxony, who had recently come to London, at the age of seven-and-twenty, as agent for the city of Bremen with the Commonwealth; but he was, from this time forward, to be to all intents and purposes a naturalized Englishman, and a kind of second

---

[1] Marvell's Works, edited by the Rev. A. B. Grosart, I. 403—417. I have discussed elsewhere, at some length, the question of the authorship of the Latin lines on Cromwell's Portrait (Milton's Poetical Works: Cambridge Edition, II. 343—352.)

Hartlib, and was to attain very honourable celebrity in that character. The following letter to him from Milton will explain itself:—

TO HENRY OLDENBURG, AGENT FOR BREMEN.

Your former letter, Honoured Sir, was given to me when your messenger, I was told, was on the point of return; whence it happened that there was no opportunity of reply at that time. While I was afterwards purposing an early reply, some unexpected business took me off; but for which I should certainly not have sent you my book, *Defence* though it is called, in such a naked condition, without accompanying excuse. And now I have your second letter, in which your thanks are quite disproportioned to the slenderness of the gift. It was in my mind too more than once to send you back English for your Latin, in order that, as you have learnt to speak our language more accurately and happily than any other foreigner of my acquaintance, you should not lose any opportunity of writing the same; which I believe you could do with equal accuracy. But in this, just as henceforward the impulse may be, let your own choice regulate. As to the substance of your communication, you plainly think with me that a "Cry" of that kind "to Heaven" transcends all bounds of human sense; the more impudent, then, must be he who declares so boldly he has heard it. You throw in a scruple after all as to who he is: but, formerly, whenever we talked on this subject, just after you had come hither from Holland, you seemed to have no doubt whatever but MORUS was the author, inasmuch as that was the common report in those parts and no one else was named. If, then, you have now at last any more certain information on the point, be so good as to inform me. As to the treatment of the argument, I should wish (why should I dissemble?) not to differ from you, if only because I would fain know what there is to which one would more readily yield than the sincere judgment of friendly men, like yourself, and praise free from all flattery. To prepare myself, as you suggest, for other labours,—whether nobler or more useful I know not, for what can be nobler or more useful in human affairs than the vindication of Liberty?—truly, if my health shall permit, and this blindness of mine, a sorer affliction than old age, and lastly the "cries" of such brawlers as there have been about me, I shall be induced to *that* easily enough. An idle ease has never had charms for me, and this unexpected contest with the Adversaries of Liberty took me off against my will when I was intent on far different and altogether pleasanter studies: not that in any way I repent of what I have done, since it was necessary; for I am far from thinking that I have spent my toil, as you seem to hint, on matters of inferior consequence. But of this at another time: meanwhile, learned Sir, not to detain you too long, farewell, and reckon me among your friends.

Westminster, July 6, 1654.[1]

It was not the first time by any means that Milton had been told he might be mistaken in attributing the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor* to Morus. As long ago as October 1652, when the first copies of the book had reached London, and Hartlib and other friends of Milton were indignant more especially at the printer Ulac on account of the Dedicatory Preface in his name in abuse of Milton, Ulac, in writing to Hartlib on that subject, and explaining that he was but the nominal author of the Preface, had informed him also that "Mr. Morus was not the author of the Book." Ulac, who vouches the fact himself, adds that he had Hartlib's reply by him, of Oct. 29, 1652, containing these words: "I am glad that you have told me that Morus is not the author of that most vile and scandalous book."[2] There can be no doubt that Hartlib had conveyed Ulac's assurance to Milton. There can be as little doubt that Milton had utterly disbelieved it. And certainly not without abundant reason. What was Ulac's bare word, Ulac's own character with Milton being what it was, against the universal belief in Holland, as proved not only by the famous piece of Leyden correspondence in the *Mercurius Politicus* of Sept. 27, 1652, but also by private letters of information which Milton had received and was still receiving? Even after Ulac's letter of denial had reached London, what were the reports from Holland? Still that Morus was the author, or author-in-chief,—the hypothesis that he was merely editor having been overwhelmed by the stronger belief; that, accordingly, his name was in everybody's mouth; that the standing jest among the Dutch wits was that Morus had proved himself a very clever fellow by the double feat of having written such a book under Salmasius's roof, to the great man's high delight, and at the same time having seduced Madame Salmasius's waiting-maid, to the great man's sore vexation; nay, that Morus himself seemed to exult in the first part of the feat, having openly trafficked in copies of the book, and turned his reputed authorship of it to account in his warfare against Madame Salmasius and Bontia in the matter of the other accusation? Morus, nobody but Morus, could be the author of the book! So Milton had firmly concluded in the end of 1652, and nothing had happened for more than a year to shake his belief. On the contrary, it had been confirmed by fresh rumours from Holland, fresh letters from friends, and by new conversations with foreigners arriving in London, including, as we have just seen, the Bremen Envoy, Henry Oldenburg. When, therefore, late in 1653 or early in 1654, Milton had set himself to his long-delayed reply, he had proceeded in the belief, nothing doubting. With only the precaution of phrases here and there implying that there might have been a division of labour in the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor*, Salmasius having helped, and perhaps others having helped, he had dictated on from first to last, punishing Morus, always Morus, as the prime culprit.

---

[1] Epist. Fam. 14.

[2] Ulac's Preface, entitled "*Typographus pro Se-ipso,*" to the Hague Edition of the *Def. Sec.*

But lo! when the *Defensio Secunda*, in which Morus was thus gored and slaughtered, was all written, and all or nearly all in type, but before it had been printed off, a strange thing had happened. The story requires a little detail.

Morus, let us first explain, was still in Amsterdam. His lawsuit with Madame Salmasius and Bontia, which had caused an immense excitement, and which had been fought on both sides unflinchingly, seems now to have been over; indeed, it may have been over before the death of Salmasius in September 1653. It had ended in his favour. By decree, in the Supreme Court of Holland, Bontia had been non-suited, and Morus freed from the charges against him without having been put to his oath. Already, before this acquittal in the Civil Court, Morus had passed with success through the more dreadful ordeal of an inquiry into the same charges and into his conduct generally by his fellow-clergy in the Synod of Utrecht. In this assembly of his Reverend Fathers and Brethren there had been investigations, there had been speeches, and especially there had been a debate whether a sackful of charges brought by delegates from Leyden in support of the prosecution (the collected gossip, I infer, of Madame de Saumaise) should be admitted in evidence. It had been decided at last that the documents should be admitted; and then, after one knows not how much reading and farther making of speeches, it seems to have dawned all at once on the whole Synod that they had nothing whatever to go upon judicially. Accordingly, without calling on Morus for any appearance in his own defence, the finding had been, "That in the papers brought forward by the Delegates from "Leyden, relating to the litigated cause in dependence before "the Supreme Court of Holland, nothing has been found of "weight to take away from the churches their wonted liberty "of inviting M. Morus to preach when there is occasion." There had been great congratulations of Morus over this result; and the Very Reverend Moderator of the Synod, Riverius, shaking hands with him, or embracing him in the Dutch fashion, had said to him jocularly in French, "*Never was Moor whitewashed as you have been to-day.*" To make all handsomely complete, he had preached publicly next Sunday in the church of Utrecht, by appointment of the Synod, and with the members of the Synod among his audience. Morus, who tells us all this himself, adds that he would have much preferred a less summary decision of the case, which would have permitted him to be heard in the Synod, and to meet, point by point, every charge against him. He had said as much, he says, to members of the Synod, and had received this answer: "The Law *condemns* no man unheard; but it may rightly *acquit* some persons unheard." And so he had been obliged to be content. He still held his Professorship of Sacred History in Amsterdam; the kind of suspension from occasional pulpit-duty which had been enforced by the late scandal had been removed; and he might walk about freely, and hold up his head. At the very best, however, such a whitewashing process as he had passed through fails to be quite sufficient. It leaves stains and suspicions. There were still winks and finger-ends round Morus in the Amsterdam streets; the gossip and the jokes about him still went on through Holland; the she-dragon Madame de Saumaise, and the girl Bontia, though they had lost their cause, were wildly on the watch in Leyden; and he had many enemies besides. His only hope was that by living on, and doing his best, he should yet recover himself wholly, and live it all down. And, poor man! why should he not have been allowed the chance of recovering himself? Why should he not have been left alone?[1]

What must have been the horror of Morus when he learnt that he was not to be left alone,—that he had still to pay the penalty of his connexion with the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor*, and that the penalty was about to be inflicted in a pamphlet by Milton, of quite blasting severity, then actually at press? The agreeable news, it appears, was conveyed to him by Milton's friend and ours, good Mr. John Durie, of whose locomotive habits we have heard enough never to be surprised at finding him anywhere to-day, wherever else we left him yesterday. He was in Amsterdam, it seems, in April 1654, perhaps on his way to London from attending Whitlocke to Sweden; and there, meeting Morus, he had told him of Mr. Milton's forthcoming *Defensio Secunda*, and given him a description of it. Morus was dreadfully alarmed, and gave such assurances to Durie that he was not the author of the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor*, and furnished him with such testimonies of friends to the same effect, that Durie promised to write to Milton immediately, so as to stop the *Defensio Secunda* or have its contents modified.[1] Actually Milton did receive two letters from Durie on the subject. In the first, dated from the Hague, April $\frac{14}{24}$, 1654, Durie wrote, "I have "been informed by a Middleburg minister, who is very "familiar with Morus, that Morus is not the author of that "book, but a certain French minister, whose name Morus "gave him under promise of secrecy." In the second, dated from Amsterdam, April $\frac{19}{29}$, Durie again wrote, "I have con"versed with Mr. Hotton [minister of the French church in "Amsterdam], who is a very keen Royalist, and extremely "intimate with Morus; and he told me, what I wrote to you "in my former letter, that Morus is not the author of the "*Clamor Regii Sanguinis*."[2] These letters must have reached Milton in May 1654, when his *Defensio Secunda* was just about to issue from Newcome's press. But Morus had not trusted only to Durie's letters to Milton. He had set other and more powerful agencies at work. "As soon," says Milton, "as Morus had learnt from my friend, by what chance "I know not, but certainly with no intention on my friend's "part to curry favour with him, that I was bringing out an "Answer to the *Clamor Regii Sanguinis*, the man's conscience "was all in a heat, and he bethought himself of expedients "on all sides. Among other signs of his trepidation and "meanness of mind, he who was ready enough, so zealously "and wickedly, to bring out a late notorious book against "others, now writes a suppliant petition to the Ambassador "of the United Provinces residing here, begging and beseech"ing him to deal with the Lord Protector, with every possible "urgency, for the suppression of my *Defence*. When he had "for answer that there was no possibility whatever of that, "and that there was appearing all the same, and was actually "already shipped for his benefit, a book exposing him, and "containing a specimen-collection of his misdeeds, then, in "extreme agitation, running hither and thither, what a "miracle of circumspection was our gentleman, all on the

---

[1] The facts in this paragraph are from Morus's own work of self-defence called *Fides Publica* (1654—5), with consultation of Bruce's Life of Morus (1813). Neither work gives the exact dates of the termination of Morus's suit and his acquittal by the Utrecht Synod; nor have I been able to ascertain them either from Bayle's Article *Morus*, or from the Heinsius-Vossius-Gronovius Correspondence in Burmann's *Sylloge*. I have had to *infer* that they were late in 1653 or early in 1654. It is possible, however, that they were rather later; for Milton does not seem to have been aware in his *Def. Sec.* (i.e. as late as May 1654) of any such "whitewashing" of Morus in Holland. On the contrary, he had heard that he had been excommunicated at Middleburg, suspended from the liberty of preaching at Amsterdam, left nothing but his Professorship!

---

[1] Morus's *Fides Publica.*

[2] Milton's *Pro Se Defensio.*

"outlook, and hardly daring to remove his eyes from the "shore where the book was to land!"[1] A most savagely exact summary of the facts, as will appear from the following documents:—

Letter "to M. Morus, Minister and Professor at Amsterdam," from M. Nieuport, Dutch Ambassador in London (original in French): dated Westminster, $\frac{\textit{23 June,}}{\textit{3 July,}}$ 1654:—"Sir, The day after yours was delivered to me, I had an opportunity of communicating it to Mr. Thurloe, Secretary of State, and of the Orders of His Highness the Protector of this Commonwealth, in the presence of M. de Beverning, my colleague, praying him with the most serious earnestness to be so good as to speak of the matter to his Highness without delay; and afterwards, considering that the press of affairs might prevent him, I asked two gentlemen, friends of mine, who are particularly acquainted with Mr. Milton, to represent to him the reasons for which we desired, in the present juncture of time and affairs, that he should not publish the book we had been assured he had written against another entitled *Clamor Sanguinis Regii*, or at least that he should not do you the wrong of attributing that work to you, and that, if he persisted in refuting that book, he would not insert anything in it that could affect you. These gentlemen brought me word a few days afterwards that he had so strong an impression that it was no other than you that was the author that they could by no means dissuade him: only that he had requested them to assure us that he would let nothing proceed from his pen of an unbecoming nature, or in any way prejudicial to the States of the United Provinces. Upon this, imagining that the authority of His Highness would prevail more than this private intercession, I did not fail to reiterate to Mr. Thurloe, sending him a copy of your letter, that which we had so seriously recommended to him, waiting from day to day for some resolution or declaration on the part of His Highness on the subject. But, by reason of the great design which was discovered some days afterwards [i. e. the Gerard-Vowel Plot against His Highness's life, discovered May 20], they were so occupied that they could attend to nothing else; and meanwhile the said Milton published what he had prepared. I am very sorry that, after the most violent spirits among those of the Naval Service have accommodated themselves to the Peace [the Peace between Cromwell and the Dutch, proclaimed April 27], one who makes profession of letters and sciences, which raise men above the vulgar, has chosen, notwithstanding our request, to show so little moderation. Meanwhile, Sir, with all good wishes, &c.—*Signed* WILLIAM NIEUPORT."[2]

---

[1] *Pro Se Def.*

[2] French original published by Morus in his *Fides Publica.*

Letter to Morus from an anonymous correspondent just arrived in London: dated Aug. 7, 1654:—"Sir,—At my arrival here I found Milton's book so public that I perceived it was impossible to suppress it. This man hath been told that you were not the author of the Book which he refuted: to which he answered that he was at least assured that you had caused it to be imprinted, that you had writ the Preface, and he believes some of the Verses that are in it, and that that is enough to justify him for setting upon you. He doth also add he is very angry that he did not know several things which he hath heard since, being far worse, as he says, than any he put forth in his book; but he doth reserve them for another, if so be you answer this. I am sorry for this quarrel,—which will have a long sequence, as I perceive; for, after you have answered this, you may be sure he will reply with a more bloody one: for your adversary hath met with somebody here who hath told him strange stories of you."[1]

Before Morus had received either of these letters he had known the worst. Copies of Milton's book were then round him in Amsterdam and in all Holland. "Two weeks ago," writes Vossius to Heinsius, then in Stockholm, "I sent you Milton's book against Morus." Milton's own account is curious. "When Morus knew that the book had arrived, "and perceived how he had been shown up, he entreated the "bookseller, whether merely by prayer or by bribe as well I "know not, not to sell a single copy until he should have got "ready his answer. . . . Thus that good man, at his own "discretion, suppressed fifty correct and well-printed copies, "more or less. Meanwhile, however, Ulac, thinking to make "profit out of another man's risk, goes to press with as many "faulty copies of a reprint as he thinks fit." Here also Milton is exact. Ulac, cool and calculating tradesman as he was, though he had printed the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor* and lent his name for the preface to that book, had no objection whatever to make profit by publishing at the Hague a reprint of Milton's counterblast, with all its invectives, not only against Morus and Salmasius, but also against himself. The book was sure to be in demand, and his Hague edition would hold the foreign market against the imported English one. To Ulac this was all in the way of business; but it was death to Morus. "They have had here," says one of Thurloe's Letters of Intelligence from the Hague, dated July 3, 1654, "two or three copies of Milton against the famous "Professor Morus, who doth all he can to suppress that book. "Madame de Saumaise hath a great many letters of the said "Morus, which she hath ordered to be printed, to render him "so much the more ridiculous. He saith now that he is "not the author of the Preface of the *Clamor;* but we "know very well the contrary. One Ulac, a printer, is re-"printing Milton's book, with an apology for himself; . . . "the profit he will make of it is the chiefest reason. Morus "doth all he can to persuade him from printing of it." In short, in spite of all that Morus could say to the contrary, Ulac was determined to bring out a foreign edition of the *Defensio Secunda* as soon as possible, with a Preface replying to the attack on his own character therein contained; and all that he would concede to Morus was that, if Morus could get *his* Reply ready in time, it should go to press too, so that both books might appear together, and people might have "Milton *versus* Morus," and "Morus *versus* Milton," bound in the same volume if they liked. In July or August, 1654, that was Ulac's arrangement. How ill it suited Morus appears from another of Thurloe's news-letters from the Hague, dated July 24, "Morus saith he dares not answer, "the time being changed; for, if he speak ill of the Govern-"ment of England, the Magistrates of Amsterdam would "turn him out." He was still trying, therefore, to suppress Milton's book by buying up the copies that had come abroad. He had bought, it was rumoured, 500 copies that had come to Elzevir.[1]

---

[1] Thurloe, II. 529.

During the first six months of the Protectorate (Dec. 1653—June 1654), as we have already said, there is an absolute blank in the records of Milton's Latin Secretaryship in as far as mere official letter-writing is concerned. He had been availing himself, during those six months, of the willingness of the Lord Protector and the Council to treat him as Secretary Extraordinary, or even as Secretary Emeritus; and, engrossed with his *Defensio Secunda*, his labour on which might count with the Protector and Council as in itself a splendid service of Secretaryship, he had left ordinary office-work to Thurloe and Meadows. No sooner, however, was the *Defensio Secunda* published than again, whether of his own accord or at the call of the Council, he did resume ordinary office-duty to some small extent. The following, so far as is known, were Milton's first letters written for Oliver as Lord Protector.

---

[1] Burmanni Epist. Syll. III. 675; Milton's *Pro Se Def.*; Thurloe, II. 394 and 452.

(XLV. AND XLVI.)—TO THE COUNT OF OLDENBURG, *June* 29, 1644:—Two letters to this interesting German potentate, both dated the same day—(1) One, which is of a more public nature, acknowledges letters from the Count dated the 20th of the preceding January, and also the Count's kind congratulations on the establishment of the Protectorate brought by his two envoys, Frederick Matthias Wolisog and Christopher Grifiander. These gentlemen had fully discharged their mission; and the Protector now intimates to the Count that he heartily grants the two requests they had made in the Count's name—to wit, the comprehension of the Count and his territories in the Peace with the United Provinces, and the renewal of the Safe-guard formerly granted to the Count and his subjects by the Parliament. (2) The other Letter is more private and still more cordial. The Count, it appears, excessively anxious for Oliver's friendship, and perhaps vexed at the delay of an answer through his envoys, had sent his own son, Count Anthony, to London, with letters of introduction, dated May 2. Milton now, for Cromwell, expresses in a very handsome manner the sense entertained of this courtesy. His Highness has observed Count Anthony for himself, and is delighted with his manners and disposition. He is sure that the people of Oldenburg will find in this young man a worthy son of his excellent father, whose prudence and virtue in keeping his territories in profound peace so long, with war raging all round him, cannot be sufficiently admired. His Highness reciprocates the truly affectionate spirit towards himself shown by the Count, and thanks him for his magnificent present.—The "magnificent present" was no other than that team of beautiful and spirited horses of which we hear as the cause of one of the accidents in Cromwell's life. On the 29th of September, following the date of this letter, Cromwell, returning from a picnic in Hyde Park with Thurloe and others, would drive the horses himself. They took fright, and he was thrown from the coach-box, dragged along for some space by the foot, and considerably bruised.

A pistol went off in his pocket; and thus people learnt, if they did not know it before, that the Protector carried arms. (Carlyle, III. 63-64.) The incident was much celebrated at the time in prose and verse. It figures in poems by Waller and Marvell.

(XLVII.)—To John IV., King of Portugal, *July* 10, 1654 :[1]—This day the Portuguese Ambassador's brother, Don Pantaleon Sa, was beheaded on Tower Hill; and on the same day the Portuguese Ambassador himself, Don John Roderick Sa, having concluded the Portuguese Treaty with the Protector, had left London on his return home (ante p. 557). With a rather heavy heart, he took this letter with him. "Most Serene King," it said, "The Peace and "Friendship with the English Commonwealth, requested by your "Majesty some time ago by the despatch hither of a most ample "and splendid Embassy, initiated by the Parliament which was then "in power, and by us always earnestly desired, we have at length, "by God's favour, and in behalf of that Government of the Commonwealth which we have accepted, happily concluded, and, as is "hoped, ratified for ever. Wherefore your Ambassador Extraordinary, Don John Roderick de Saa Meneses, Count of Penaguida, a "man approved by the judgment of your Majesty, and found by us "also highly excellent for politeness, talent, and prudence, is now "restored by us to you, with distinguished praise for the accomplishment of his business, and with the Peace in his conveyance. As "to your Majesty's letter, dated Lisbon, April 2, testifying, by no "obscure signs of singular good-will, what regard your Majesty has "for us, how disinterestedly you wish well to our dignity, and how "greatly you rejoice that we have undertaken the Government of "the Commonwealth, I shall endeavour that all henceforth may "easily understand, from my readiest good offices at all times to "your Majesty, that I am really gratified by the same."

(XLVIII.)—To Charles Gustavus, King of Sweden, *July* 11, 1654 :[2]—The King had written express Letters to the Protector announcing his accession to the Swedish Throne by the abdication of Christina, and intimating his desire to abide by the League and Alliance with the Protector agreed to by that Queen. Cromwell acknowledges the honour done him by the communication, and is happy to think the alliance safe under so good and popular a sovereign as Charles Gustavus. The most Miltonic thing in the letter is the reference to Christina as the late "most august Queen, "daughter of Gustavus, a heroine whose equal in all things praiseworthy many ages backward have not produced."

In the *Defensio Secunda* Milton had, with a skilful and yet perfectly allowable perception of what might give weight to such a book, especially on the Continent, taken care to introduce the names of all such men of eminence as had favoured him, in any notable manner, with their friendship or acquaintanceship. Thus, in the succinct sketch of his own life which he had thought it right to insert in contradiction of the attacks on his character in the *Regii Sanguinis Clamor*, he had first mentioned Sir Henry Wotton's kind letter to him on his setting out on his foreign travels in 1638, and his introduction to the famous Hugo Grotius in Paris by the English ambassador Lord Scudamore, and had then passed on to relate more minutely his extremely courteous reception and entertainment by the Italian wits and scholars then of celebrity in the Academies of the various cities, and most of them alive still — Jacopo Gaddi, Carlo Dati, Frescobaldi, Coltellini, Buommattei, Chimentelli, Francini, and many others, in Florence, Holstenius and others in Rome, and, above all, the illustrious Manso, Marquis of Villa, in Naples—ending with a recollection of his pleasant intercourse at Geneva, on his way home again, with the distinguished theologian John Diodati. In all this Milton, we may say, had been dexterously inweaving into his book testimonies to his own respectability. For the same purpose, at a much later point, he had dwelt on the extraordinary outburst of feeling in his favour which had been evoked among foreigners by the publication of his *Defensio Prima.* The passage may now be quoted entire: "One French law-court, and perhaps one Parisian official, at "the instigation of birds of ill omen, burnt the book; but "what numbers of good and learned men over all France "read it nevertheless, approve of it, like it cordially! What "numbers do the same over the immense extent of all "Germany, the very home of liberty, and over other lands "too, wherever any traces of liberty yet remain! Nay, Greece "herself, Attic Athens herself, as if coming to life again, "expressed *their* applauses through their own Philaras, one "of their noblest. This also I am able to say with truth,— "that no sooner had our *Defensio* appeared, and the attention "of readers was growing warm over it, than every ambassador

---

[1] Utterly undated in the Printed Collection and in Phillips; dated "Aug. 1658" in Skinner Transcript, but with glaring error. The Letter, by its contents, dates itself as above, within a day or two.

[2] No. 28 in Skinner Transcript (whence I take the date); No. 46 in Printed Collection and in Phillips, with date "July 4" in each.

"or envoy then in London, whether from foreign prince or "from foreign state, either offered me his congratulations "personally on my chancing to meet him, or wished to see "me at his house, or visited me at mine. It would be wrong "here to omit a tribute to your memory, ADRIAN PAUW, the "glory and ornament of Holland, who, when you were sent "as ambassador to us with the highest honour, caused your "great and singular regard for me, though it was never my "fortune to see your face, to be signified to me again and "again by numerous messages." As the wording of the passage implies, Pauw, the venerable Pensionary of Holland, who had found time to pay compliments to Milton even in the midst of his anxious and fruitless peace-negotiations in London in June 1652, was now deceased. But the Greek Philaras was still alive, and reappears interestingly in our story at this very point.

There had come a crisis in the fortunes of the eminent Greek. That particular Duke of Parma in whose service he had been for many years was dead, and had been succeeded by another Duke, his son. The consequence had been the arrival in Paris, in April 1654, of a person appointed by the new Duke to supersede Philaras in his ministry for Parma at the French Court. Not only to supersede him, it appears, but to have him disgraced. For Mazarin, having some grudge against Philaras on old accounts, had made such representations to the new Duke that orders had been sent from Parma to arrest the ex-minister, and detain him to meet any charges against him that might be forthcoming from the Cardinal. In a letter of intelligence from Paris, dated April 22, 1654, the writer, after mentioning the fact of the arrest, and speaking of the general sympathy of the Parisians with "M. de Villeré," i. e. Philaras, adds, "I hear they "have found amongst his papers a letter of civility Mr. Milton "had writ to him." This must have been Milton's letter of June 1652 (ante pp. 444, 445). Unless the general liberalism and Philhellenism of that letter were viewed as compromising, it must have gone to the credit of Philaras rather than otherwise. In fact, there was no case against Philaras; and on the 17th of May the same Parisian correspondent of Thurloe intimated as much. "M. de Villeré, Resident for the "Duke of Parma," he says, "having had his liberty as soon as "his papers and letters had been searched over, wherein no "such calumnies as had been imputed to him have been "found, the Pope's Nuncio, in the name of the most part of "the other public Foreign Ministers which are in this city, "hath since written a letter upon that subject unto the said "Duke; whose new Resident hath not yet received audience "from their Majesties nor the Cardinal Mazarin." Accordingly, six weeks later (July 1), it is announced, "The Duke "of Parma hath written a letter unto the King, whereby he "entreats his Majesty to agree to the re-establishing of M. "de Villeré in his Residency, without mentioning Cardinal "Mazarin in the said letter." There were still difficulties, however; and, for some reason or other, Philaras took the opportunity of his enforced leisure to pay a visit to London. In a letter, of date Sept. 27, 1654, addressed to him there, the writer, a Parisian friend named Cochet, says, "I have heard "of your safe arrival in London. The Princess Palatine fell "ill presently after her arrival here, so that I was fain to "cause your letter to be delivered unto her by her gentleman, "and I have seen her but once and that in bed. She declared "to me how sorry she was for your disgrace, and that she "would do all that she could to reconcile you to the Cardinal. "I hear that your enemies will endeavour to render you "guilty, by reason of your passage into England. You know "that that country is held with us very suspect."[1]

One of the very first acts of Philaras on arriving in London had been to call on Milton. The reappearance of Milton's old letter to him in the recent search of his papers, and the handsome mention of his name in the *Defensio Secunda*, may have whetted his desire to see and talk with Milton himself. The meeting seems to have been an unusually interesting one, for it drew from Milton perhaps the finest and most touching of all his Latin Familiar Epistles. As the date shows, it must have been sent to Philaras at his London hotel.

---

[1] The Letters quoted will be found in Thurloe, II. 246, 289, 418, 629. I have put the dates into English style. The French spelling "Villeré" seems to have prevented hitherto the recognition of Milton's friend Philaras as the person meant in these passages of the Thurloe Papers.

TO LEONARD PHILARAS, ATHENIAN.

As I have been from boyhood an especial worshipper of all bearing the Greek name, and of your Athens in chief, so I have always had a firm private persuasion that that city would some time or other requite me splendidly for my affection towards her. Nor, in truth, has the ancient genius of your noble country failed my augury, since in you, an Athenian born, I have had bestowed upon me one of the most loving of friends. When I was known to you by writings only, and you were yourself separated from me by place, you opened a communication with me most courteously by letter; and, coming afterwards unexpectedly to London, and visiting a man incapable any more of seeing his visitors, even in that calamity by which I am rendered an object of more regard to none, and perhaps of less regard to many, you continue now to show me the same kind attention. As you have, therefore, suggested to me that I should not give up all hope of recovering my sight, and told me that you have a friend and close companion in the Paris physician Thevenot, especially distinguished as an oculist, and that you will consult him about my eyes if I furnish you with means for his diagnosis of the causes and symptoms, I will do what you advise, that I may not haply seem to refuse any chance of help offered me providentially.

It is ten years, I think, more or less, since I felt my sight getting weak and dull, and at the same time my viscera generally out of sorts. In the morning, if I began, as usual, to read anything, I felt my eyes at once thoroughly pained, and shrinking from the act of reading, but refreshed after moderate bodily exercise. If I looked at a lit candle, a kind of iris seemed to snatch it from me. Not very long after, a darkness coming over the left part of my left eye (for that eye became clouded some years before the other) removed from my vision all objects situated on that side. Objects in front also, if I chanced to close the right eye, seemed smaller. The other eye also failing perceptibly and gradually through a period of three years, I observed, some months before my sight was wholly gone, that objects I looked at without myself moving seemed all to swim, now to the right, now to the left. Inveterate mists now seem to have settled in my forehead and temples, which weigh me down and depress me with a kind of sleepy heaviness, especially from meal-time to evening; so that not seldom there comes into my mind the description of the Salmydessian seer Phineus in the *Argonautics*:—

> All round him then there grew
> A purple thickness; and he thought the Earth
> Whirling beneath his feet, and so he sank,
> Speechless at length, into a feeble sleep.

But I should not forget to mention that, while yet a little sight remained, when first I lay down in bed, and turned myself to either side, there used to shine out a copious glittering light from my shut eyes; then that, as my sight grew less from day to day, colours proportionally duller would burst from them, as with a kind of force and audible shot from within; but that now, as if the sense of lucency were extinct, it is a mere blackness, or a blackness dashed, and as it were inwoven, with an ashy grey, that is wont to pour itself forth. Yet the darkness which is perpetually before me, by night as well as by day, seems always nearer to a whitish than to a blackish, and such that, when the eye rolls itself, there is admitted, as through a small chink, a certain little trifle of light.

And so, whatever ray of hope also there may be for me from your famous physician, all the same, as in a case quite incurable, I prepare and compose myself accordingly; and my frequent thought is that, since many days of darkness, as the Wise Man warns us, are destined for every one, my darkness hitherto, by the singular kindness of God, amid rest and studies, and the voices and greetings of friends, has been much easier to bear than that deathly one. But if, as is written, "Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God," what should prevent one from resting likewise in the belief that his eyesight lies not in his eyes alone, but enough for all purposes in God's leading and providence? Verily, while only He looks out for me and provides for me, as He doth, leading me and leading me forth as with His hand through my whole life, I shall willingly, since it has seemed good to Him, have given my eyes their long holiday. And to you, dear Philaras, whatever may befall, I now bid farewell, with a mind not less brave and steadfast than if I were Lynceus himself for keenness of sight.

Westminster: September 28, 1654.

When this letter was written, Cromwell had already met his First Parliament, and had that first experience of it which convinced him, if he had not anticipated the fact, that the real difficulties of his Protectorate were but beginning, and that the nine months he had passed, he and his Council so harmoniously together, since he had assumed the Single-Person sovereignty and the title of Lord Protector, might be looked back upon as a period of ease and calm in comparison with what was coming. Only through those first nine months of the Protectorate have we yet led Milton, and we have to follow him through the rest. In doing so, we shall find him still always, as heretofore, an admirer of Cromwell personally, and in politics mainly an Oliverian, though in this last respect there were to be perhaps deeper and deeper private reserves of opinion, if not open modifications. We shall find him also doing an amount of work for Cromwell, and that at moments of supreme interest in the history of Cromwell's European relations, far greater than might be guessed from the small quantity of his official letter-writing that has had to be reported in the present chapter, or than might have been supposed possible in the case of a man who, even at our present date, had been two years totally blind. Milton was to be fetched out of his blindness more and more as Cromwell had need of him, and was to be Cromwell's Foreign Secretary more and more distinctly to the very end of the Protectorate.

END OF VOL. IV.

PR3581 .M41 v.4
The life of John Milton: narrated in
Princeton Theological Seminary–Speer Library
1 1012 00005 1732